

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVII, No. 5
WHOLE NO. 1180

May 7, 1932

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	99-102
EDITORIALS	
Public Utilities Regulation—Unemployment— What It Costs to Be Governed—The "Key- Note" Speeches—Shall We Close Our Col- leges?—And Support These?.....	103-105
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Bruening and Hitler: A Study in Patriotism —Human Rights in Spain—Handicapping Love in Marriage—A Bus through Oklahoma —Hartmann Grisar, S.J., Historian.....	106-113
SOCIOLOGY	
The Mooney Case.....	113-114
EDUCATION	
The Glorified American Infant.....	114-116
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	116-117
POETRY	
Lamps	117
BACK OF BUSINESS	117
LITERATURE	
Perfectionism—A Reply?.....	118-119
REVIEWS	119-121
COMMUNICATIONS	122

Chronicle

Home News.—On April 23 the House Economy Committee completed its omnibus bill on Federal decreases in expenditures. In its final form, it would hand over to the

Economy
Legislation
Executive order under certain restrictions; on the other hand, it included a consolidation of the War and Navy Departments into a Department of National Defense, and an eleven-per-cent cut on all salaries of Federal employees over \$1,000. The former of these was opposed by the President, and the latter rejected his plan of Federal employment in a five-day week with staggered furloughs. A bitter fight took place in the House as soon as the bill was introduced. It was discovered that of the \$67,000,000 to be saved on the salary reductions, \$55,000,000 would be borne by those whose salaries were less than \$2,500; consequently, the House, breaking away from its leaders, immediately raised the exemption on salaries to \$2,500. Moreover, the House had previously thrown open the bill to amendments. It was freely said after this that the coalition of Democrats and Republicans had once again destroyed a Committee bill. It was not yet known whether the coalition had an alternative plan, as they had had in the tax bill.—By hurried decision, the President attend-

ed the annual meeting of the Governors at Richmond, Va., and delivered a speech calling for State and local economies as well as Federal, the reduction of Federal and local competition in taxes as it exists at present, and of the cost of government. The President said that before the War the cost of all government represented about eight per cent of the national income; during the boom times fifteen per cent; and now twenty per cent. At the same time Federal income had been cut by almost fifty per cent, since it is, through the income tax, largely dependent upon the state of business.

After hearing President Whitney of the New York Stock Exchange, the investigation underwent a sharp change during the hearings of Matthew A. Brush, Percy

Stock
Exchange
Investigation
A. Rockefeller, Thomas Bragg, and Ber-
nard E. Smith. The Committee showed more interest in the bull market than in the bear market and concentrated on the operations of pools, thereby widening its original purpose, which had been to discover if the decline in security prices was a maneuver operated for some ulterior purpose; consequently, a smaller committee of five members was appointed, and it was proposed to send experts to Wall Street to investigate records and transactions. The investigation took another sudden turn when Representative La Guardia charged that financial writers had been paid to boom stocks, and to support his contention produced canceled checks involving seven or eight well-known names. Thereupon the investigation threatened to enlarge still further, bringing the big commercial banks under its scope.

The Senate Finance Committee ended its hearings on the tax bill, while agitation for restoration of the sales tax grew. Both parties agreed to work quickly in drawing

Tax bill
up the bill, and it was expected that it would be ready for the Senate by the next week. Some of the proposals adopted were: to double the present normal income tax rate; to increase the surtax maximum to forty-five per cent on incomes above \$1,000,000; to step up the corporation rate to fourteen per cent; and to apply the income tax even to veterans' pensions and retirement pay. On the other hand, it voted to restore the exemption from normal taxes of dividends on stocks, and to impose a two-cent stamp tax on checks and drafts of five dollars and more.

On April 26 two important primaries were held, in Massachusetts and in Pennsylvania. In spite of optimistic predictions to the contrary by his managers Governor

Politics
Roosevelt suffered a severe defeat in Massachusetts, the highest vote for a delegate pledged to him being lower than the lowest vote cast for a Smith delegate; consequently

ex-Governor Smith received the full body of pledged delegates. The contest in Pennsylvania was very close, and at last reports Roosevelt was running 20,000 votes ahead of Smith, in a total vote of 177,000. It was not clear yet, due to the special Pennsylvania system, how many delegates each would have, but the Smith forces predicted that he would secure thirty-two and maybe forty out of the total of seventy-six. Observers everywhere predicted that these results had delivered a severe check to the candidacy of Governor Roosevelt and that ex-Governor Smith had fulfilled his prophecy of "putting a chock under the bandwagon."

Austria.—In three Diet elections held in Austria the followers of Hitler and the Fascist movement scored remarkable gains, practically wiping out the strong influence of the Pan-German group. The Nazis Gain now demand that general elections be held, believing that they are strong enough to win control of the Government. The elections went off peacefully without the disturbing riots which have often prevailed. It was reported that under pressure Austria had been forced to enter a compensation treaty with France which makes the Austrians pay the difference in exchange values at the time the French creditor receives payment.

China.—In Northern and Eastern Manchuria the revolution against the recently established Manchukuo Government grew in severity and on April 27, by way of aiding the Government to crush the rebels, three Japanese brigades numbering about 10,000 men opened a major offensive against them. On the other hand, the weakness of the Changchun regime headed by former Emperor Pu Yi and the unpopularity of the Government seemed to be evident from its obvious needs to depend upon Tokyo's assistance to maintain its position. The Chinese armies that were continuing organized resistance to the new regime exceeded 20,000 and were reported to be augmented by 80,000 unorganized irregulars. It was presumed that they are receiving help from Russia.

Civil disorders continued in the Fukien province and on April 27, according to an Associated Press dispatch, Cantonese leaders predicted that 80,000 Communist soldiers approaching Amoy and Foochow would turn from their objective to face the Canton army, about 20,000 men, then entering Fukien province. Reports indicated the two armies would soon meet in a decisive engagement. The Cantonese forces had also started a reconquest of Kiangsi province.

It was stated that both China and Japan had finally accepted the Shanghai evacuation formula as offered by the British Minister to China, who is a member of the League Shanghai Evacuation Formula of Nations mixed Commission on Shanghai. However, the report was not definitely confirmed. As understood in Geneva, the only gain to Tokyo by the new formula was that it made doubtful whether the mixed Shanghai com-

mission supervising evacuation could make decisions by a majority vote. On the other hand, the formula added to the mixed commission's powers the right to report any failure to execute the terms of the armistice. It was anticipated that the League inquiry commission in China would hardly submit any serious report on Shanghai before the September meeting of the Assembly.

Czechoslovakia.—Disappointment was felt over the holding up in the French Parliament of the proposed French loan to the Czechoslovak Government of 600,000,000 francs, probably till after June. A slight improvement in the foreign-trade deficit was reported for the month of February. Increases in direct taxation, as on State monopolies as tobacco, were reported as failing to achieve their purpose, since they produced only abstention on the part of the people. Cooperation on the basis of preferential customs tariffs of the small Danubian countries, again desired by France, was again officially welcomed by Czechoslovakia, though with explicit reservations, owing to the threat to Czechoslovakia's economic independence in which she has led the smaller States.

France.—The foreign correspondents of the American press seemed satisfied last week merely to report the incidence of the French elections and the fact that Premier

Importance of the Elections Tardieu and M. Herriot, together with more than 3,000 candidates for the 615 seats in the Chambers, were waging active campaigns. Several dispatches, after stating that there was a general lack of interest on the people's part, predicted a swing to the Left in the Chamber as a result of the elections. Few of the correspondents brought out the fact—of great interest to American Catholics—that France is really split in this campaign over a religious issue and that the Lay Laws—their abrogation or continuance—were probably a paramount question, with grave consequences for the Church, for Catholic education, and for the Catholic future of France in the balance. In fact, the American press has only once or twice—and then very vaguely—hinted that the Right parties, under Tardieu's leadership, are strongly supported by Catholic voters, and that the Left, under M. Herriot, is aggressively anti-clerical. Several factors, recently emphasized by Catholic observers of the situation, gave rise to the hope that the "swing to the Left," so widely predicted by the press, would not eventuate. In the first place, the recent Hitler victory in Prussia was expected to have a repercussion on French voters that would force many of them into the Right camp. Secondly, Secretary Stimson's recent visit to Tardieu, interpreted throughout the nation as a meddlesome effort to bring pressure against the Premier in favor of Left policies, it was thought would have a contrary effect upon the strongly Nationalist voters and incline their sympathies still further away from Herriot and his followers. Catholic forces, moreover, were well organized and aroused against the anti-clericals during the past several months. Finally, M. Herriot was still blamed in the popular mind for the inflation of the franc some

years ago, and many voters felt that a Right victory would save them from a repetition of the debacle. Competent observers therefore predicted that the Right would show an unexpected strength. The real crisis, from the Catholic viewpoint, would come, not during the first elections, but during the second election on May 8. The French system of double balloting (which requires a second election in the event that no one candidate wins a clear majority over all the others) makes political maneuvering possible. The anti-clerical parties will continue their practice of agreeing to withdraw all but one of their candidates in the second elections, thus concentrating the entire strength of all the radicals from all parties upon one candidate. Hence, the second ballot in many places will mean a fight between several members of the Right, who will divide about the same number of votes as on the first ballot, and one anti-clerical, who will win the votes of everybody else. The French elections will be watched with grave concern by Catholics the world over.

Germany.—The Prussian Diet election of April 24 failed to relieve the political tension in Germany while it increased the apprehensions and fears in France where

Prussian Diet Election the Left Wing had been waging a war against a too intense nationalism, now fanned again into flame. While the Nazis were checked in their spectacular rush for control of Prussia, Hitler and his well-trained men concluded their most successful campaign with what seemed a triumph for National Socialism. Out of a total of 22,402,000 votes cast in Prussia, the Nazis secured 8,008,000 against 4,675,000 for the Socialists, 3,374,000 for the Centrists, 2,820,000 for the Communists, 1,525,000 for the Nationalists, and 300,000 to 100,000 for each of the lesser groups. This gave the National Socialists in the Diet, which will convene in June, 162 seats as against 6 in the former Diet. The Socialists won 93, the Centrists 67, the Communists 57, the Nationalists 31, the remainder of the 422 mandates being distributed over the smaller parties.

National Socialists Make Gains In four of the five States in which Diet elections were held on the same day, the National Socialists proved the strongest party, though never gaining the required majority to control the Government fully.

Bavarian People's Party, which won 45 seats against the Nazis 43. In Wurttemberg Hitler claimed 43 seats; in Hamburg, 51; in Anhalt, 15. In all these States there was much speculation on the various possible coalitions, but all eyes were on Prussia as the plan adopted there will most probably determine the line-up, except in Anhalt, where the Nationalists and People's Party were expected to combine. It was generally conceded that the Centrists would have the minority control in Prussia; and while many suggested that the Centrists join with the Nazis to form a Government, their leaders were reluctant to commit themselves since what is done now will affect the reorganization of the Reichstag. The French reaction to Hitler's growing power was manifested in financial circles where heavy French selling caused a

break of seven and three-quarter cents in sterling exchange; and in the political arena where M. Herriot showed signs of leaning toward the Right on the matter of security and national defense.

Great Britain.—An increase of from ten to twenty per cent in the tariff on manufactured goods was made operative on April 25. Semi-luxuries and luxuries were taxed

Tariff Duties up to thirty per cent. A duty of 33 1-3 per cent was placed on certain varieties of iron and steel importations. This duty was scheduled to last for three months pending further investigations. The increased tariff was explicitly stated to be for the protection of home industries in regard to articles capable of being manufactured in Great Britain in substantial quantities. The impositions were looked upon as preparations for bargaining with the Dominions in the matter of preferential tariffs at the Ottawa Conference in July next. The United States, more than one-third of whose exports to Great Britain are in manufactured goods, was seriously affected by the tariff increases. Sir Herbert Samuel, the Liberal Home Secretary, attacked the tariff provisions, though he asserted that he and his associates were in substantial agreement with the Government on all matters except the tariff. The omission of the War-debt payments in the budget was further explained; it was regarded as a matter that could not be settled definitely until after the Lausanne Conference; there were no grounds for the opinion that Great Britain intended to default on the payments to the United States.

Ireland.—The debate on the second reading of the Removal-of-the-Oath act, scheduled for April 27, was slightly delayed through the action of the Labor members who

Removal of Oath Bill voted with the Cosgrave party against the Government on a matter of procedure. President De Valera, in his ad-

dress before the Dail, reaffirmed his contention that the removal of the Oath from the Constitution required no permission from Great Britain and stated emphatically that he would not be drawn into negotiations on this matter. He added: "When the people are ready for a completely independent Republic, Fianna Fail will be quite ready to lead them." As leader of the Opposition, Mr. Cosgrave attacked the bill in no uncertain terms. He called it an amazing "piece of political chicanery," "an instrument of repudiation and dishonor," and a "breach of the Treaty in fact and intention." He stressed the economic advantages of a friendly union with the British Commonwealth. Among the provisions of the Removal-of-the-Oath bill are: the deletion of Article 17 of the Constitution, which states the form of the oath to be taken; the deletion of the words in Article 55 requiring Ministers appointed by the Representative of the Crown to take the oath as given in Article 17; and in Article 50, the deletion of the italicized words in: "Amendments of this Constitution *within the terms of the scheduled treaty* may be made by the Oireachtas, etc." In the British Parliament, the Dominions Secretary, J. H. Thomas, spoke of the ac-

tion of the Irish Government on the day before the second reading in the Dail. He called attention to Section 2 of the Constituent act whereby amendments to the Constitution repugnant to the treaty "be absolutely void and inoperative." He also condemned explicitly the deletion in Article 50. He declared the Removal-of-the-Oath bill a repudiation of the 1921 settlement as a whole. No new negotiations would be taken up with the Free State, he stated, until the bill will have passed the Dail and the Senate.

Nicaragua.—In the middle of the month irregulars began a new rebel drive which was especially marked in the Ocotal area. The first engagement resulted in three

Martial Law American officers and eight Nicaraguan National Guardsmen being killed. The outlaws, who were well armed with machine guns, rifles, and hand grenades, were reported also to have had heavy casualties. On April 27, following new clashes between the Nicaraguan National Guard patrols led by the United States marines and the outlaws, martial law was declared in all the departments of the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua, that is, Nueva Segovia, Jinotega, and Matagalpa. A state of war was declared to exist in the Department of Esteli and a number of districts in the Departments of Leon and Chinandega. Schools were closed and prominent families were reported as quitting the capital because of the anxiety created by the situation. President Moncada sent a special message to Congress dealing with the revision of the Constitution and stating that changes were necessary for the welfare of the country.

Poland.—The return of Marshal Jozef Pilsudski from his extended vacation, somewhat restored to his former vigor, gave rise to surmises concerning possible changes

M. Pilsudski Returns in the Poland Cabinet. A conference was planned by President Moscicki; and three former Premiers were on hand, but to the surprise of the public, M. Pilsudski was not called. It was reported that Premier Bartel has leanings towards the Left in the present economic conditions, and wishes to make the opposition share some of the responsibility of Government measures. The action of M. Pilsudski in failing to make a call on the President was considered to indicate that he disapproved of such conferences of his former subordinates who seemed to be wavering before the bitter attacks of the opposition.—The Senate of the Free City of Danzig bitterly denounced the rumors that they were giving asylum to Hitler's outlawed storm troops.

Russia.—The Government announced on April 23 that 1931 incomes of collective farms, which were stated as composing more than sixty per cent of the entire cul-

Alleged Income Rise vated area in the Soviet Union, nearly doubled those of 1930 and greatly exceeded the earnings of individual peasants. Hence the collective farmer's situation was heralded as vastly improved over that of the non-collectivized. Figures, however, were given only for certain collective farms; nor was mention made of the great difficulties

which farmers have in obtaining manufactured goods.—Preparations were being made in Moscow for the perennial gorgeous reception to the Turkish Ambassador, Tewfil Rushdi Bey, with banquets, races, etc.

Disarmament.—Secretary Stimson, at his visit to the Geneva disarmament conference, was credited with making every effort to improve the relations between France and Germany; as well as to bring about

Stimson Visit a settlement of the Franco-Italian impasse. His efforts, however, were apparently brought to naught when word was received at Geneva on April 27 that Premier Tardieu, of France, would be unable to come to Geneva, owing to illness. Mr. Stimson, however, had succeeded in having a resolution passed unanimously by the conference endorsing the qualitative principle in the reduction of arms. The resolution provided for the selection of certain classes of weapons with the view to their prohibition or internationalization. The reference to internationalization was included out of deference to the French proposal, whereby heavy offensive weapons would be placed under international jurisdiction. The agreement was welcomed in Germany, but discounted in France. At the same time, the impending French elections obstructed the freedom of the French delegation. Mr. Stimson, it was announced, would return to the United States without further delay.

International Economics.—Franco-American relations came upon the stage when, in an election speech at Avignon, on April 24, Edouard Herriot, Radical Socialist leader, attacked the Hoover moratorium on

Herriot Objects to United States German debt payments and accused the United States of interference in European affairs. The Young plan, he said, had been accepted as a final settlement of Germany's reparations, and now the whole question was being raised again. Whatever good had come out of the conversations in Washington between former Premier Laval and President Hoover could have been brought back "in a little sailboat."—It was said that France and Germany would both agree to June 16 as the date for the Lausanne conference on reparations. Observers deplored the lack of preparations for the same.

The time for the Eucharistic Congress in Dublin comes on apace, and Francis Talbot has with a broad brush painted the picture of the sacred pageant the world will see there. His paper is called "Ireland's Hosting for the Host."

"Will the Negro Turn Communist?" is the title of a paper by John LaFarge, and expresses the anxiety that many people are feeling. After a careful study of the question, Father LaFarge will present his temperate conclusions.

Following up his recent articles on mixed marriages William I. Lonergan will come to their effects on the children. "The Children of Mixed Marriages" will be the same careful analysis as Father Lonergan's article in this issue.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1932

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
GERARD B. DONNELLY
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Public Utilities Regulation

A ROUND-TABLE conference on the regulation of public utilities held some weeks ago in New York was attended by practically all the authorities in this field. Possibly that is why the conference disagreed on the report of its policy committee. While admitting that this was correct, "in general," some thought it too severe in spots, and some thought that in other spots it was too weak. However, the conference agreed to receive the report, and to make it public.

The policy committee found that regulation, as now generally administered, is a sad failure. It has not protected the investor against the loss of billions of dollars, "resulting from unsound methods of valuation and financing." It has failed to secure for the small consumer rate reductions "corresponding to the decline in prices and wages, and the trend to increased domestic use." It has also failed to "safeguard the credit of the companies placed under its supervision and control." Promoters who control public utilities, in the interest of speculative profits derived from manipulation of their securities, have been able to force a policy of evasion that is progressively weakening the effective control of public utilities, so that today regulation affords adequate protection neither to the honest investor nor to the consumer.

Once more the committee recommends the remedies which have been recommended ever since State and Federal regulation began, but never generally adopted. It begins by stating that access to the company's records is fundamental. But the records must be intelligible, as well as complete; hence revision of the present uniform classification is necessary. Again, members of regulation boards and their assistants must be appointed on the basis of competence, without reference to political affiliations or interests. Rates should be determined on the basis of the actual cost of each class of service, plus a fair profit on the capital required. Finally, regulatory power should be centered in the States, acting either

separately, or through joint agreements, with Federal legislation to facilitate these agreements when necessary.

In other words, the committee thinks it necessary that public-utility boards should be allowed to understand what they are regulating, and be clothed with authority to enforce their decisions. This is certainly an elementary demand, but it has been made again and again without much result. Some of these recommendations have been adopted locally, but no one jurisdiction, it would seem, has adopted all of them. Yet without knowledge and authority, a public-utility board is worse than worthless, since clever and unscrupulous speculators can easily control it, to the detriment of both investors and consumers.

As the price to be paid for light, heat, and electric power affects nine out of every ten households, it might be thought that the regulation of public utilities would be a subject of interest to the general public. Oddly enough, it is not; at least the public has not manifested an interest that has resulted in successful regulation. Alfred E. Smith has been quoted as saying that he could win attention for many of his projects as a legislator and as Governor of New York, but that he had little success when he tried to interest the people in the regulation of public-utility corporations. Possibly the corporation, touched with a little of that spirit which Mr. Whitney attributes to the New York Stock Exchange, may by degrees reform themselves. But there is not much hope in that quarter, or in any other, until a well-informed and vigorous public opinion leads the way.

Unemployment

THE figures on unemployment issued by President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, make sad reading. "At the peak of the usual busy spring season," he reports, "industrial unemployment is increasing." April shows a marked increase, whereas there was a decrease in unemployment in this month even in 1930 and 1931. The number of the unemployed is now estimated to be 7,950,000, "and we cannot count on any improvement from industrial gain in the near future."

At the same time, wage cutting and part-time employment are also increasing. In some instances, these moves can be justified on the half-loaf principle, but not in all. Of the two, wage cutting is the more difficult to justify, since, as a rule, the old wage is not restored when the crisis has closed. For this reason, the President's plan to give Federal civil-service employes a five-day week, with a month's furlough without pay, is less objectionable than the eleven-per-cent reduction of all wages over \$1,000 which Congress seems to favor.

The local relief committees are working hard, but there is general agreement that very many of them will not be able to hold out to the end of the year. Some report that they can carry on until August, and a few have already reached the end of their resources. In some, but not in all, of these latter cities, appeals will be made for State aid. But, as Mr. Green rightly points out, if we take the unemployment problem as a whole, "it is no longer

possible to meet it by relief measures alone." In his opinion, "there is only one way to give men enough work to keep body and soul together and at the same time to stimulate buying—divide work time among those who need work by shortening work hours."

Once urged on economic and humanitarian grounds, the five-day week, and the three-days-of-employment plan, are now proposed as the first step towards economic recovery. Could either scheme be universally adopted, employment, although at a low wage, would show a marked increase.

While the prospect is not encouraging, brooding will not make it better. Even when facing an economic question, it is well to remember that our Heavenly Father to whom we daily pray for our bread, knows our needs and will provide for them, wisely and lovingly. When He is with us, of what shall we be afraid?

What It Costs to be Governed

SINCE bootlegging takes a billion from the Government every year, and crime presents a bill that adds at least another billion, the Government is not infrequently hard pressed to find new fields for taxation. Generally, however, it finds them. We elected a President in response to the call, "vote for Hoover and insure prosperity," and that President ends his term with the country in the midst of the hardest times and the highest taxes it has ever seen. The fields have been found, and they will be worked vigorously.

But, as Melvin A. Traylor, the Chicago banking expert, recently observed, few people realize "the gigantic proportions which the cost of government has reached in the United States." If they did, perhaps they would take steps, in spite of the politicians, to reduce it.

Mr. Traylor's figures lead to some conclusions that would be highly amusing, if they were not sadly tragic. To pay for the upkeep of city, State, and Federal Governments, two dollars must be collected every week from every man, woman, and child in the United States. Thus it costs the average family about \$10 a week to share in the blessings of this great and glorious government, which, however, does not appear notably successful in protecting said family against murder, robbery kidnapping, and other crimes. This same average family will find at the end of the year that it has expended more than \$500 to keep the ship of state afloat.

Put in another way, the father must lay aside that sum every year, before he can think of paying the rent, or of buying clothes and food for his family. Should he be fortunate enough to work for 200 days a year, he must earn about \$2.50 every day for the Government, before he can begin to earn one penny for himself. Of course, when he puts his wife to work in a factory, and sends his children to engage in street trades, his per capita is lessened; which is fortunate, especially when his daily wage does not reach \$2.50. However, all can return home at night to enjoy the meal which the mother, after a grinding day in the factory, has prepared.

Figures, of course, can be made to tell any type of

story; just as under skilled fingers the organ will yield any tune. But it is plain enough that government in the United States costs too much, and that the increasing cost forms one of the reasons for the present depression. A table has been issued by Lammot du Pont, president of one of the largest corporations in the United States, which supports, in the main, Mr. Traylor's complaints.

In the 1927-1932 period, the cost of the Federal Government alone increased by sixty-three per cent. Much of this increase is due to foolish, unconstitutional schemes which lobbyists began to foist upon cowardly Congresses as far back as 1916, chiefly through the "fifty-fifty" plan. The War-time expenditures had accustomed the country to think in terms of billions, and the cranks and the sciolists were not slow to take advantage of that fact. Money poured out like water, and no one, least of all the responsible parties in the Government, stopped to think that the tank would soon be empty. It is empty enough now, and we shall bend our backs for years, carrying water to bring it up again to a normal level.

Like every sensible man, Mr. du Pont holds that the cost of government can never be brought within tolerable bounds until Congress "curtails non-essential services and functions." But Congress will never do that until the people insist upon it, and the people will never insist, until they realize the sad fact that upon them, and them alone, devolves the obligation to pay for the orgies in which the Government indulges. Demos is often a fool, and a vain fool, to boot.

The "Keynote" Speeches

IT is reported that Senator Barkley, of Kentucky, is worrying about the "keynote" speech which he has been appointed to make at the national convention of the Democrats next June. As Senator Barkley is not only facile but, in the opinion of many, unusually eloquent, the report is probably untrue.

In any case, neither the country nor the Senator need worry. As R. H. L. wrote not long ago in his Chicago *Tribune* column, the Senator can read the Chicago telephone directory, if he wishes, and before "he gets as far as Abbot, A. A., delegates will be applauding madly," while by the time he reaches "Abernathy, J. O., the convention will be in a turmoil, standing on the chairs, shrieking, 'pour it on 'em, Barkley, hittem again.'" If no telephone book happens to be handy, the Senator can recite "Mary Had a Little Lamb," and he will "start a demonstration that will last forty-five minutes."

Now and then a keynoter makes a speech that is worth listening to. Claude Bowers made one of that kind four years ago, and Bryan, although he was not the official keynoter, in 1896. Many years ago, a keynote speech had a serious purpose, like the buttons on the back of a man's coat. Today, it is not much more useful, or ornamental, than the buttons.

These conventions could exist nowhere except in the political atmosphere of the United States which is supercharged with hysteria. Once party conventions were deliberative assemblies, organized as a protest against the

selection of candidates by secret caucus. Today they are bedlam, and with a few exceptions delegates are chosen because of their resemblance to puppets. The exceptions are chosen to pull the strings.

No, it really does not make much difference what Senator Barkley puts into his speech. The parades around the hall, the forty-five-minute applause periods, the fights, simulated and real, and the bands trying to drown one another out, will go on, even if Senator Barkley falls a victim to stage fright as he rises to begin his speech. But another method of selecting candidates might make a difference to the country.

Shall We Close Our Colleges?

THE endowment funds of fifty larger American universities and colleges increased from \$433,244,000, in 1922, to \$923,522,000, in 1931. The actual increase was \$490,278,000, representing a gain in the decennial period of 113 per cent. Even in 1931, with its deepening financial depression, the increase was \$48,940,000, or nearly six per cent. It is somewhat surprising to observe too, that the largest increase was in 1930, also a depression year; but at no time in the decade was the steady mounting of endowments checked.

The share of our Catholic schools in these vast sums is very small. In 1922, forty-eight institutions had endowments in excess of \$2,000,000, and by 1931, the number of such institutions had risen to 108. But only four Catholic schools were among them: the Catholic University of America, Creighton University, Marquette University, and Villanova College. The Catholic University and Villanova led the list, according to the "World Almanac," each with an endowment of \$3,000,000. Creighton and Marquette barely qualified for inclusion in the \$2,000,000 class. Compared with the endowments of Harvard, in excess of \$100,000,000, with Columbia's \$80,000,000, and Chicago's \$59,000,000, these Catholic endowment funds are hardly worth recording.

One wonders how long this state of Catholic poverty is to be borne, and, more significantly, how much longer the Catholic colleges can continue their inestimable services to State and Church without endowment. The administrators and the faculties of the Catholic schools have given all that they can give. Without their spirit of sacrifice which, on the average, is little short of heroic, it would be impossible to carry on at all. Teachers and administrators either give their services free, or receive a stipend which barely suffices for their decent support. Twenty years ago, the need of endowments was not so keen. Today, the need is so keen that we shall shortly be forced to the choice of raising endowments for our colleges, or closing them.

The number of laymen among the teachers has grown steadily in the last two decades. In the universities, with their professional schools, and even in some of the colleges, they far outnumber the priests and Religious. These men and women can justly claim a stipend which in every sense is a living wage; that is, an income which will allow them to live in keeping with their station, to put aside something for times of emergency, and to make pro-

vision for their old age. When they cannot get this from the Catholic school, they must secure a means of support elsewhere.

Again, the field of college work has broadened. The modern college must engage in activities, some desirable, others barely tolerable, unknown two decades ago, and all necessitate large expenditures of money. Year by year, these demands increase. No sooner has the Catholic school "met the requirements" of some standardizing agency than the requirements are shifted. Among the most pressing of these modern requirements is an endowment fund. Where are these endowments to be secured?

We face no abstract theory, no merely academic question, when a standardizing agency presses the endowment problem. A college may be graded A-plus in its administration, the personnel of its faculty, in its library and laboratory facilities, and in its general standards, and fail to secure its rating on the sole ground of lack of endowment. Here and there by persistently presenting their claims on the basis of academic achievement, some institutions have put off the evil day. But it cannot be put off much longer. Either our colleges must be properly endowed, or they must be closed.

And Support These?

LAST month a group of students at the University of Michigan submitted a series of questions to a selected list of teachers. According to the *Detroit Times*, the questions turned chiefly on points of religion or morality. The answers give a fair picture of the atheism that masquerades as wisdom in our secular universities.

Dr. John F. Shepard, of the department of psychology, answered that there was "no scientific proof of a Deity." However, the matter was not important, since "There doesn't need to be a Deity. Communion with 'God' is just a personal experience, a kinesthetic hallucination."

Questions dealing with morality were met with equal directness. "No goal that we know of lies beyond our human interests," wrote DeWitt H. Parker, of the department of philosophy. But that did not seem to be of much moment either, since "There is no particular brief for morality, other than that it is good for you, for your best interests." Even the football coach, usually an oasis of fundamentalism in an arid waste of atheism, fell in line with the professors. "The chief values in life are happiness, comfort, and a satisfaction with living, both in this life, and in the life to come," answered Fielding H. Yost, "if there is one."

The University of Michigan is no worse than any other State or private institution founded on the proposition that neither religion nor morality can claim an essential place in education. But is it a school that a conscientious Catholic can choose for his son or daughter?

The Catholic college is a school for the training of Christian men and women. We can have that, or we can have an institution for the propagation of a shallow, blatant, anti-social atheism, destructive alike of private and of communal morality.

Which shall we choose?

Bruening and Hitler: A Study in Patriotism

JOSEPH F. THORNING, S.J.
(Special Correspondent of AMERICA)

WHEN I conferred with Dr. Bruening, Chancellor of Germany, last autumn, I asked him one question which was not meant for publication at the moment. It was this:

"What does your Excellency think of the National Socialism of Herr Hitler?"

The gentle smile which played about the lips of the Chancellor was disarming. Then he answered:

"Why, it is all *theory!*"

Becoming a bit more serious, he continued:

"Just at present in Germany we cannot waste time or energy on theories. We face hard, driving emergencies every day and almost every hour. Is this the hour for rhetoric? Germany has the will to survive and, therefore, President von Hindenburg and myself are united in our determination to face the responsibility of *action*. After all, words, promises, are easily uttered. A program of accomplishment is a different matter. Who can tell what the National Socialists would do in office? Are they actually unanimous among themselves on that score?"

Ever since this interview, questions have kept recurring: "What are the understandable features of the Nazi program? Is the latter simply an emotional attitude combined with a genius for organization? Or is it, in part, a rational protest against an almost unbearable situation, the passionate refusal of a cultured nation to accept a position of permanent inferiority? And if so, can it be that the German Chancellor, who proved his valor in the World War, does not react to the legitimate aspirations of his people? In short, how does the patriotism of Dr. Bruening differ from the nationalism of Herr Hitler?"

In the first place, the German Chancellor refuses to embark on a campaign of hate. He has not the least sympathy with Nazi truculence, which will not be satisfied until it provokes another war of revenge. Herr Hitler boasts about a new conscript army of 6,000,000 men, emulating all the dazzling mistakes of the Hohenzollern regime. The Chancellor, through the leader of the German delegation at Geneva, proposes nothing less than the total abolition of standing armies and condemns conscription as a vile slavery, the veritable degradation of human personality. If one were to believe each one of the Nazi orators in turn, Germany should mobilize an army on every front, prepared to wage war for the obliteration of the Polish Corridor, for the immediate capture of Memel from Lithuania, and for the "rectification" of the Rhineland frontier. But for Dr. Bruening the will to peace is "one of the Christian commandments." Consequently, he is willing to wait for other statesmen and peoples to accord his country justice, whereas the Hitlerites would demand German rights, or what they conceive to be German rights, at the point of the bayonet.

And yet there is nothing weak or pusillanimous about the foreign policy of the Reich. Internationally, Ger-

many enjoys greater respect than at any period since the Armistice. Without bravado, bitterness, or even a trace of temper, there is a quiet insistence on fundamental principles. Instead of threats and ultimatums we see a firm demand for "equality of status" and a reminder that the Covenant of the League of Nations has as its cornerstone the equality of members, great and small. Although public opinion in Germany is inflamed about the alleged violation by Lithuania of the Statute of Memel, the Government of the Reich makes its appeal to the League Council on juridical grounds and is willing to have the matter referred to the Hague Tribunal. While certain of the Great Powers press for a reparations agreement, which would represent a mere suspension of the Young Plan, the Chancellor of Germany declines to participate in a solution that is not final and decisive. While others have talked and shouted themselves hoarse in criticism, the mild-mannered Dr. Bruening has formulated a definite line of national policy and expressed his determination to maintain it by exclusively peaceful means.

This was the discovery which threw Hitler himself from the ranks of the extremists in his party, who wanted to seize power by force of arms, into the curious position of a Fascist who preferred a regime installed with all the trappings of a sober legality. In short, when the Nazi leader got in touch with the Chancellor with a view to possible cooperation, he received the "surprise of his life." He found out that the German Government already had a foreign policy, an army, and a police force. The police force was ready to enforce internal order; the army could be relied upon to suppress a coup d'état; and the Stresemann dream of "fulfillment" with regard to reparations had long ceased to be a matter of practical politics. The last development had been brought about not by dint of fierce speeches or defiant gestures, but by the irresistible pressure of events. The world crisis had transformed a local problem into what was admittedly a matter of universal concern. To Herr Hitler's amazement, the Foreign Office found little difficulty in adjusting itself to the new exigencies of *Realpolitik*.

In this way, and by an utterly peaceful process, the most colorful banner in the Nazi repertoire transferred itself automatically from the citadel of party headquarters at Munich to the masthead of the Bruening Government on the Wilhelmstrasse. That is to say, the Chancellor revealed Germany's inability to make further reparations payments; and, if he did this in the calm, undemonstrative manner that is natural to him, it was as clear and unmistakable a declaration as any Nationalist manifesto from the "Harzburg front." Again, we must note a distinction, if not a difference. The Chancellor did not say, "We will not pay," but simply "The payments cannot be made." After all, it is one thing to default and defy creditors; another to invite an inventory, confident that

the most critical examination of receipts and expenditures must emphasize one conclusion: "German credit is incompatible with continued political payments on the scale of the Young Plan." It is historically important to note that Germany has reached this point in the liquidation of the World War, not because of floods of Nazi oratory, but thanks entirely to the careful statecraft of a Chancellor whose good faith is never questioned in the world capitals.

To be sure, the statement of Dr. Bruening did not evoke any paeans of joy from the French press, but neither did it provoke another occupation of the Ruhr. The same statement, accompanied by rebel yells or violent threats from the Nazi camp, might easily have whipped the nationalistic forces in France to such a pitch of fury that counsels of discreet moderation would not have been heard. Then, instead of veiled threats of economic and financial reprisals, there might have been serious question of once more occupying the bridge heads at Mainz and Cologne. After all, there may be such a thing as mildness which dispels wrath. And one may be patriotic without wearing a brown uniform or brandishing a spear.

Under the circumstances one almost feels sorry for Herr Hitler. He had set the stage for his own dramatic entrance; he had rehearsed his role so long and memorized every word of his trumpet-like defiance of France. To appear in "shining armor" in Berlin, to proclaim an end of French tribute, to inaugurate the Third Empire with a "clean sheet," that had been the part for which he had cast himself. And now a man of peace has done it all without the help of Klieg lights or loudspeaker. The eloquent leader of the Nazi hosts must feel like an amateur actor who has just seen a master tragedian play his favorite role.

The Fascist chieftain again appeared at a disadvantage in the scramble for power which characterized his policy from early January to the present hour. For a moment it appeared that measures of conciliation would prevail and that the outside world would see the inspiring spectacle of a united Germany. Dr. Bruening was willing to resign, provided his retirement would enable all parties to support President von Hindenburg, the symbol of German unity. Twice the Chancellor proffered his portfolios to the President. The latter, casting about for a Government, was told that the price of Nazi cooperation would be complete possession of every key office in the Cabinet, the Chancellorship, the War Department, the Departments of the Interior and of Justice. To these demands the President was unwilling to submit. He could not in conscience, he said, open the door to chaos. Sacrifices would have to be undergone for the common good; personal ambition postponed and a truce declared in party politics. It was sound counsel in a crisis. The price was one Dr. Bruening was quite prepared, one might say, eager to pay; but not so Herr Hitler. Perhaps that is the best commentary on the patriotism of the one and the nationalism of the other. On the page of history which of the two German leaders will be represented as embodying the immortal principle: *Salus populi, suprema lex*; the highest law is the people's welfare?

Human Rights in Spain

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH

ONE of the most amazing facts about the Spanish official mind which impresses the observer who comes to Spain from foreign parts is its nonchalant disregard for the most binding and solemn guarantees of the law. Or perhaps it were better to say, the wiliness of the reasoning by which it manages to evade them. After one has had a period of close contact with Spanish "statesmen" or their official minions, one comes to the conclusion that they seldom expect words to mean what they say—not even their own.

In the new Constitution there are what appear the most iron-clad undertakings for the protection of the citizen, his rights, and his property. But within a few weeks of the Constitution's birth, nearly all of them had been broken. Citizens are being tried by military tribunals, fines are imposed by Civil Governors or other officials without hearings or processes of law, newspapers are suspended or their editions seized, individuals are detained indefinitely as governmental prisoners, dispatches to the foreign press are censored and the censorship denied, all in open contravention of the Constitution.

Whenever the Government is taken to task by some member of the Cortes, there is an ingenious explanation on the part of a minister. To cite but one example of the Government's method, there was the recent suspension for more than a month, on the simple fiat of the Civil Governor, of the Barcelona daily, *Solidaridad Obrera*. That the newspaper was the organ of the Syndicalists, with whose doctrines one may or may not agree, is beside the point. The issue involved was the right of the Government to suspend a newspaper, and without a hearing at that.

The case of this paper is cited from among many merely because there was, in the sequel to the seizure, an illuminating commentary upon the subterfuges of which the Spanish official mind is capable. When the Government was taken to task in the Cortes, the Prime Minister, Manuel Azaña, explained that the paper had never been suspended at all. All that had been done was to close the plant (including the editorial offices) because certain clandestine literature had been struck off in the newspaper's printery.

The most flagrant violation of the Constitution was the Government's recent seizure of the property of the Jesuits. Or rather of what the Government pretends was their property, for it appears that most of the lands and buildings which the Government has sequestered did not belong to the Jesuits. Since the Constitution specifically says that no property, not even that of Religious Orders, shall be expropriated without compensation, certain friends of the Jesuits brought suit against the Government, challenging its decree.

The Supreme Court has just decided this suit negatively, at least insofar as relates to the suspension of the decree, in an opinion which is a brilliant example of that elusive ability, to which reference was made at the outset, to nullify the plainest guarantees of the law by

explaining them away or so interpreting them as to render them without effect.

The Court reached the conclusion that the decree could not be suspended because "administrative acts realized in the function of gestures of the public service, have an executive character and because their execution is bound up with the general interest to which the resolutions into which such acts are converted respond; and when, by exception, the particular interest, affected by a determined resolution, prays that its execution be suspended, there arises a conflict between this particular interest, to which it is suitable that the disposition taken not have effect, and the public service and interest, whose convenience is based upon the necessity that that which it has done shall be accomplished at once," then, to make a long story short, the particular interest has no relief.

Well! Well! Is there really anything more to be said? Who is the private citizen of Spain, after all, rashly to suppose he has any rights when an administrative act is being realized in the function of gestures of the public service?

In fairness it should be said that the above quotation

may have some elements of condensation or paraphrase. It is taken textually from a good Republican newspaper, *Luz* of Madrid. Spanish court decisions are too wordy to be waded through by this writer.

The court further said that in order to assess any indemnification which might be due to the Jesuits for such of their property as was seized by the Government, it must first be proved that the property ever existed, and if it did exist, that it belonged to the Jesuits. (Undoubtedly some of the property seized did belong to them, although, as has been conclusively indicated, most of it did not.)

The court amiably adds that since the property in question, if it existed, "is susceptible of estimation," it "can" of course be "metallically restored, (i.e., paid for), at the opportune moment." But the petitioners are reminded that the State is an entity "whose solvency is guaranteed by the character of a permanent institution which is peculiar to it."

Which seems to be the court's polite way of saying that the petitioners may bring their knitting and prepare for a long wait.

Handicapping Love in Marriage

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

CATHOLIC legislation on mixed marriages is based on considerations looking both to the parties themselves and to their offspring. These considerations, while chiefly regarding the good of their souls and their eternal welfare, also regard their material and temporal happiness and prosperity.

At the base of every true conjugal union must be love. Without this there may be cohabitation but there will never be that happy relationship connoted by marriage. Whenever, then, any couple contemplates that life-long and intimate partnership, whatever can occasion misunderstanding, suspicion, coldness, indifference, or insincerity must be carefully guarded against.

Now, it is a matter of practical experience, testified to even by those who have apparently made successful mixed marriages, that diversity of belief is bound to prove a seed of difficulty and discord. There will never be complete felicity where there is a fundamental disagreement about that which is first in life, God and religion. There will never be an adequate meeting of the minds of the husband and wife. There will always be a barrier between them. On one point they will invariably be unable to sympathize.

This is so true that thoughtful Jews and Protestants are as opposed to mixed marriages as the Church is. The recognition of this inspired the committee of the Federal Council of Churches, even in their recent criticism of the Vatican legislation on the guarantees required for dispensations for mixed marriages, to make this frank admission:

Religion is a basic interest in human life and differences in religion, if these be fundamental, may strain a marriage to the

point of breaking. . . . Statistics bearing upon the matter are not adequate but there is reason to suppose that marriages of this sort are highly unstable. Furthermore, that in many cases they lead either to the departure of both partners from the practices of religion or at least to the abandonment of any attempt on their part to provide for the religious education of their children.

The report further notes that mixed marriages were formerly looked upon with disfavor among Protestant denominations, particularly by the Society of Friends and in the Presbyterian system. It was only a few years back that an attempt was made through a commission of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to elide from their Confession of Faith the provision that "such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists, and other idolaters." The report, too, stated that the traditional prohibition of mixed marriages was justified by experience as "wise and right."

The following passage from a sermon of Rabbi Nathan Krass at Temple Emanu-El, New York City, witnesses the Jewish policy:

Even the new religions which are devoid of all the trappings and trimmings of historical religion are strongly opposed to intermarriage. This is one point on which both radical and conservative agree. Though you may say that you know of cases of intermarriage that are great successes, they are, on the whole, disastrous. . . . The basis of all marriage is a common platform. The couple must bring similar tastes and a common heritage together if the union is to have a chance to succeed. Religion is the only hope to supply that common heritage.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brinkner, of Cleveland, spoke to the same effect last March:

No man or woman has a right to enter into a mixed marriage without weighing the social hazards attached thereto and measur-

ing his strength against them. In addition to the other inevitable difficulties of married life the partners of different racial or religious origins must always endure the suspicion and frequently the hostility and hate of a world that is prejudiced, parochial and selfish. It is not fair to oneself or to one's comrade that this fact should be ignored. . . . I urge on young people involved in a possible mixed marriage to count the cost before rather than after marriage. To charge love with a burden heavier than it can bear is not so much to obey love as to betray it. . . . To be happy, partners of a mixed marriage must be persons of nobler virtue and firmer discipline than the ordinary husbands and wives.

In many respects a Catholic mixed marriage is especially unsuited for perfect harmony. Where matrimony should be a sort of fifty-fifty proposition, the Catholic not only refuses to surrender any of his Catholic beliefs or practices but actually obliges the non-Catholic to make most serious and weighty promises limiting his or her future. It is the non-Catholic that must forego the education of the children in his or her belief: it is the non-Catholic that is chiefly to be inconvenienced regarding Sunday Mass and Friday abstinence.

But there are graver reasons than this for fear of friction where there is question of a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic. The high probability is that the non-Catholic will not appreciate its sacred character as Catholicism understands it, much less the obligations and responsibilities assumed. St. Paul tells Christians that their union symbolizes the love between Christ and His Church. We know how He fulfilled the law of love. Having redeemed the world He not only took it to Himself as a partner but made it one with His own being. He made it His own body; He the Head, the Faithful His members. The Church was His mystical body—they are "two in one flesh." The union is the holiest, most self-surrendering, most permanent thing that can be imagined. Now, even such as this is the Sacrament of marriage. Altogether at variance, however, with this idealism are the popular current non-Catholic notions about matrimony that make it nothing more than a conventional arrangement. Today scarcely any non-Catholic admits that divorce is essentially immoral and absolutely prohibited. This being so, in every mixed marriage, the Catholic runs a very real risk and is put at a disadvantage.

It is a delusion to assume that because the ecclesiastical guarantees are given there is no danger for the faith of the Catholic spouse. Some danger is always there; it is a matter merely of being remote or proximate. Under the best conditions to hold firmly and to live one's religion in a divided community is not without difficulty. The very intimate nature of the marriage relation and the mutual influence each partner has on the thoughts, conduct, and practices of the other accounts for this.

Even if the non-Catholic does not positively interfere with the Catholic attending Mass, observing fast and abstinence days, approaching the Sacraments, etc., the latter will get little or no encouragement; the very indifference will lower the Catholic's morale. Moreover, the want of good example weakens. The non-Catholic eats meat on a Friday, but the other may not; the non-Catholic spends Sunday morning comfortably in bed but the other must rise to attend Mass, perhaps at an inconvenient hour: such incidents frequently repeated may

test the Catholic's steadfastness to the snapping point.

The non-Catholic either practises or does not practise some religion. If he or she is a practising Protestant or Jew, then there is more likelihood of quarrels and intellectual disputes on religious topics, which clearly is a menace to the Catholic's religion. If not practising, his religious apathy becomes a source of worry and trouble. If there be question of a non-Christian, the problem is augmented: for one partner Christ is God, for the other a mythological deity.

A mixed marriage necessitates many contacts with the other party's non-Catholic relatives and friends. These will exact that the Catholic be continually explaining his or her religion—not a bad thing in itself but something for which, unfortunately, many are not prepared. In consequence they will be secretive or apologetic about the Faith and that will weaken their own loyalty to it. Indeed, experience proves that only too often the Catholics that enter mixed marriage are the least qualified intellectually and by their religious background and habits to be thrown successfully into a non-Catholic environment.

Actually, every mixed marriage begins inauspiciously. Catholics know that the Church surrounds marriage with her most sacred and solemn rites; that she has a special Mass to invoke God's blessing on the married couple, particularly the bride; and they anticipate as the greatest happiness of their wedding day the cementing and sanctifying of their marriage vows by a Eucharistic union with Christ, the third party to their contract. A mixed marriage eliminates all these spiritual graces from the Catholic's life. Indeed, according to a theological opinion that is morally certain, the marriage of a baptized person with an unbaptized person, notwithstanding the dispensation of the Church, is not even a Sacrament for the Catholic party. This means that in such circumstances Catholics close to themselves the channels of those supernatural helps Christ intended His followers to have for the sanctification and happiness of their wedded life.

True, even in mixed marriages a priest must perform the ceremony. However, he will wear no vestments; it cannot ordinarily take place in the sacred precincts of the church, much less within the sanctuary close to the Blessed Sacrament. There will be no Mass, no nuptial blessing, no joint reception of Communion for the bride and groom. Here surely is something to give one pause from the start.

In this connection, the non-Catholic who has any religious affiliation and his or her family and friends are bound to resent the insistence of the Church that their ministers may not marry the couple and that there can be none but a Catholic ceremony. Even the Catholic, while appreciating the reasonableness of this position, will feel the hardship being imposed on the non-Catholic bride or groom and it will cast a damper on the mutual joy of their wedding day. Perhaps he or she may weaken even to doing what is mortally sinful.

With marriage the bride and groom begin their new home life. Now, there is such a thing as a Catholic home with family prayers in common, with holy pictures, the crucifix, the beads, holy water, blessed palms and candles,

similar evidences of religion, and devotional articles about the house. In a mixed marriage the common prayers will be an impossibility while the external signs of religion are apt to be, if not positively repugnant, embarrassing to the non-Catholic. Even if permitted around, they will very likely be treated indifferently or irreverently. They cannot be appreciated at their full value. Another barrier between the parties! And what a domestic joy the Catholic excludes when they cannot have the non-Catholic spouse kneeling alongside of them at that most thrilling of life's moments, Communion time?

Some day or other death enters every household. In a truly Catholic home when someone is dying everybody's first solicitude is for a priest. Even if the person be unconscious it is realized that the Catholic priest can do something to make the passage to eternity easier. In a mixed home the non-Catholic will only too often fail to appreciate this situation and hesitate or neglect to secure a priest. If the patient is unconscious or there is any great inconvenience to summoning one, the non-Catholic is apt entirely to omit it, thus perhaps jeopardizing the eternal salvation of the partner. On the other hand, if the non-Catholic is dying the Catholic knows that the rabbi or minister has no supernatural ministrations to offer and that he cannot do anything for the soul of his or her dying consort: he cannot or will not call him. Both situations are bound to be painful, embarrassing and trying.

After death the funeral! When it comes to burying the non-Catholic the Catholic necessarily experiences the grief that derives from the absence of all the consolations that religion brings to Catholic homes, the inspiring burial service, the Requiem Mass, the laying away in consecrated ground, etc. Besides, he or she cannot provide for a Protestant or Jewish burial service for the deceased. Moreover, Catholics believe in the value of suffrages for the dead and especially of the Holy Mass offered for their souls. But in a mixed marriage the Catholic must anticipate that there will be no prayers or Communions from the non-Catholic partner.

Catholics are bound to contribute to the support of their churches and schools. The non-Catholic will often resent this as involving some domestic privation. On the other side, the non-Catholic if actually affiliated with a denomination may wish to cooperate from the community purse to his or her religion and its development and expansion with the risk that the Catholic may become involved in formal and sinful cooperation towards the upbuilding and propagating of a false belief.

The Catholic will usually have no objection to bringing the non-Catholic to church. He or she, however, may not participate in the non-Catholic's services. They cannot appear to endorse the doctrine that one religion is as good as another and that it does not matter where one worships. The unevenness of the situation is bound to be felt and create annoyance and discord.

The Catholic knows that he may not read certain books or periodicals or have them about the home, and that the head of the house is responsible in this matter before God. By the non-Catholic almost no prohibition to read-

ing is recognized, certainly no Index of forbidden books. This offers an occasion for further friction.

The non-Catholic, even when a so-called "liberal," is bound to be suspicious of the Catholic when he goes to confession. This can engender all sorts of trouble. Moreover, it is not unlikely that the Catholic penitent may discuss certain domestic moral issues with the confessor whose final solution will demand the cooperation of the non-Catholic and perhaps considerable sacrifice on his or her part. One is tempted to ask, what, then?

The Catholic may wish to take an active part in certain Catholic societies. The non-Catholic will generally lack sympathy with, if he doesn't openly resent this activity. On the other hand, the non-Catholic may desire to affiliate with organizations that the Catholic must ban,—for example, Masonic lodges, the Odd Fellows, etc. This creates a new problem.

With the years the sentimental side of marriage usually wears away and the realities of life assume first place. For a Catholic these are God, the Church, his Faith, eternity, etc. What will the non-Catholic substitute?

The Christian religion is essentially one of sacrifice. All through life the Catholic has to give up many things for his Faith, sometimes social preferment, sometimes pecuniary advancement, sometimes a lucrative position, sometimes political power. This self-surrender cannot but affect a non-Catholic husband or wife. Natural love will rarely be equal to it; it takes supernatural grace to measure up faithfully to so many and such repeated demands made upon one's loyalty to a religion that one does not believe in.

A Bus through Oklahoma

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

A COMBINATION cigar store, lunch counter, soft-drink fountain, and ticket office proved to be the bus station of Guthrie, Oklahoma. A large, motherly person wiped mustard off her hands and moved from the sandwich laboratory to the ticket grill.

"A ticket for Tulsa," I announced in the aloof fashion forced upon all travelers by that most remote and impersonal of all mortals, the railroad-ticket agent. His normal temperature is, I am sure, fully five degrees below normal.

"So you're going to Tulsa," she smiled with deep personal interest. "Lovely town. I've got a sister living there. You'll enjoy the trip. Bright, sunny day." Then over my head she added to the bus driver who had entered, "You're going to have a very pleasant gentleman riding with you."

I looked around to see what pleasant gentleman was to be my companion in travel, and then, seeing no one, realized with embarrassed surprise that she was describing me. Suddenly I felt like a Dickens character just introduced by the landlady to some horn-blowing stage-coach driver.

The bus driver ushered me to a seat in his coach. "That's the shady side," he indicated. "Not many

traveling as yet, so you needn't pick a wheel." Picking wheels not being my specialty, I followed his gesture and then watched him stride up and down the sidewalk—a slim, Sam-Brown-belted, khaki-clad, clipped-mustachioed chap, by no means unconscious of the appreciative glances cast by passing maidens.

A youth spattered with good Oklahoma oil sat near me; a young Negress took the very back seat, reminding me that I was still South; the motor roared, and we were off through the streets of Guthrie for the open roads.

I had always thought that the day coach of a transcontinental train was the world's most democratic institution. A dozen flying miles had me casting my vote for the democracy of the bus.

As we swung along, every door seemed to pop open, in city, town, and countryside, framing smiling figures who waved a God-speed to our driver. Mothers in their kitchens hailed us and encouraged their children to frantic waves. Shopkeepers dashed out to billow soiled aprons in our directions. Garage mechanics lifted greasy hands in greeting. "Setters" on unpainted porches turned languidly and lifted weary pipes in our direction.

Ours was almost a triumphant procession. Ditch diggers waved battered hats, rising up from the road almost under our wheels. Ploughmen stopped their teams (or perhaps they hadn't started them as yet) to hail us from their fields. Pedestrians answered our warning honk with a cheerful shout. And to each, with the slightest swerve of our bus or the least swaying from our path, our driver lifted a steady hand in royal greeting or honked a loud but friendly horn.

A passing train may win a hail from children; the rest of mankind regards it with curiosity, chill aloofness, or visible envy. The passing of our bus was for every man and woman an affair of evident personal concern. We came, paused, and went again through an atmosphere of warm welcome and friendliness. If, when we paused at little hotels or restaurants, red-coated waiters and smiling barmaids had dashed out to regale us with hot ale, I for one should have felt them quite in key.

Gradually our bus filled with passengers. A basketball team was given a rousing cheer by the rooters who speeded it on its way to a neighboring town. Three oil drillers joined my oil-bespattered neighbor. Moist and audible kisses speeded a sister-in-law back to her home. A dear old grandmother stood humming on the sidewalk as we curved in for a landing, hummed her way into the bus, and then greeted the driver and all his passengers with a hearty "Good morning." A very Protestant lady borrowed my as yet unread newspaper, and then cleverly used its return as an excuse for handing me a Protestant tract. No Roman collar was going to deter her from her apostolic duty.

Everyone talked a bit with the driver. Everyone talked with everyone else. A timorous lady made a compact with the driver to pick her up on his return that evening.

"I'll be walking alone in the middle of the road, and you keep your eyes open for me. I'll wave my umbrella when I hear you coming, and you be sure to pick me up. I'll be scared stiff, so don't pass me by."

Fancy flagging an express train somewhere between Jones' barn and Smith's cowpastures!

About me floated bits of family gossip, school news, the chatter of neighbors, reports of church activities, and the melancholy undertones of the oil depression. It was all so very chummy and "folksy."

For some reason, life seemed much closer to the windows of the bus than ever it had seemed to the windows of the trains on which I traveled. Perhaps the train goes through backyards and keeps an almost aristocratic remoteness in the midst of its right-of-way. The bus whirls down Main Street, carries its passengers on eye level with front windows, show cases, dining-room tables, and the calmly curious face of the community. I felt that I looked through my bus windows into the very heart of the domestic and business life of a people.

Front doors were open for glimpses of intimate domestic arrangements. I saw babies playing on the floor and fancied I could read the trade name on the tireless radio. Through an open barn door I became momentary spectator of the checker game which may have decided the county championship. Stores stood open for me to study at close range the state of the retail trade. Filling stations shot their price tags quite under my nose. I could even look into the second-story window of the more pretentious school buildings and watch youth struggling at the blackboard with long division.

Farms and gardens lay like a charming border along our way. I saw the beginnings of springtime flowerbeds and admired freshly ploughed fields, was impressed with the large truck gardens near the cities, and saw housewives trimming rosebushes. I even got an insight into correct fashions for Oklahoma farmerettes: overalls worn in very startling incongruity under long cloth-and-fur coats.

The collapse of the oil industry was told in the silent fields with their skeleton derricks lifted wanly over abandoned holes, and in the crowds of jobless oil workers standing in sullen groups as we rounded the street corners of the boom towns. They alone had no wave even for our friendly driver.

We stopped, of course, for generous rests with time enough to pry leisurely into the small cities. At these semi-terminals, bus drivers met in the clubby companionship of fellow craftsmen, joshed one another loudly, cast aspersions on skill and speed, and frankly doubted the ability to arrive on schedule. (I was happy to know that there was a schedule set for this most informal journey.)

Of course the bumps and sways of the bus kept me from reading or writing or any of the things a supposedly busy man does on a train; but the whole atmosphere of the bus was too personal and intimate to permit anything so rude. One does not read or write when friends want to talk, or intimates along the roadway stand waiting for a friendly hail.

Tulsa's broad streets and very modern shops finally engulfed us. At once the passengers sank back into formal silence. Not even from a bus window would one dare wave at sophisticated city dwellers or peer into the

living rooms of efficient apartments or the multiplied activities of chain drug stores. Even our driver kept eyes straight ahead. His friends were not in the stiff boundaries of the city.

We dismounted and scattered our several ways, without a word of goodby. Civilization had caught us and choked us once more. But that didn't fool me in the least. I knew that shortly the bus would be turning back through the country where friendly people were waiting

to greet it as it carried companionable souls from one group of small importances to another. And once outside the city, the driver would again become the only modern equivalent of that beloved figure of history, the stagecoach driver.

In all probability, I shall continue to stick to the larger luxury and the greater speed of the train. But I cannot help but feel that democracy follows the line of the bus.

Hartmann Grisar, S. J., Historian

MARTIN P. HARNEY, S.J.

THE learned world has recently suffered a severe loss in the ranks of great scholars by the death of Father Hartmann Grisar, S.J., the foremost modern authority on Martin Luther. In a very special way has history been made debtor to this priestly savant because of his epochal biography of the great heresiarch, and of his many other publications on the Reformation, the early medieval Papacy, and the historical traditions of the Church. It is but fitting at his passing that some accounting be made of his life and achievements.

The life course of Father Grisar need be but briefly indicated. He was born on September 22, 1845, at Coblenz. Quite remarkable is it that three of the greatest modern historians of the Catholic Church, Dr. Johannes Janssen, Baron Ludwig von Pastor, and Father Grisar, were sons of that Rhineland whose people's faith is as beautiful as the scenic loveliness of its vine-clad river valleys. On reaching his twenty-fourth year in 1868, he became a novice of the Society of Jesus, entering the Austrian Province of the Order. His years in Religious life, numbering sixty-four, constitute quite a long span, especially for the years of a Jesuit. Aside from a considerable period of time spent at Rome in historical research, much of his life after his ordination was given to the arduous work of the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Innsbruck. His labors as a teacher of Church History are still being carried on, it is worthy to note, by his nephew, Father Joseph Grisar, S.J., at the Jesuit House of Studies in Falkenburg.

Father Grisar was about thirty-seven when his works began to attract attention. One of the first of his noteworthy publications was a monograph on Galileo, published in 1882, a valuable contribution to that much discussed question, especially in the documents which it contained. Its evident scholarship revealed to the world a new historian, gifted with a true critical spirit and an untiring energy in research. Following this initial work, in 1886 there came the extremely valuable edition of Father Laynez's "Disputationes Tridentinae" in two volumes. To edit and publish the notes of the great theologian of Trent for the use of the public was a task demanding unflagging energy. The handwriting was so difficult, and the manuscript contained so many unusual and peculiar abbreviations, that, though many had tried to decipher the text, all had given up in failure. Father

Boero, S.J., who had been officially appointed for the work, was so baffled as to declare it his opinion that there was little hope of any complete edition ever being published. Father Grisar's untiring patience succeeded in an almost impossible task.

The work which he had intended to be his life study, medieval Rome and the medieval Papacy, now occupied his attention. But, although devoting his great energies to the task, only one German volume (three in English) was published, under the title "The History of Rome and the Popes of the Middle Ages." This was but one-sixth of the work as originally planned, and it is a source of regret that the entire publication was not completed. Father Grisar assured a friend that the manuscript matter was practically finished; the scholar who would edit and publish it would render an incalculable service to History.

The realization of the need of a large critical study of Martin Luther was probably what turned Father Grisar from the medieval period to the Reformation and the life of Martin Luther. The result was the most scholarly work written by a Catholic on the subject of the great Saxon heresiarch. Three great volumes in German, translated into six large English volumes, this masterful biography marks an epoch in history writing of modern times and will long await a rival. The merits of Father Grisar's study of Luther are manifold: it is exhaustive, even a casual glance at its pages will show that; it is accurate, as the long and copious quotations and citations prove; but above all it is most fair and impartial: Luther is given credit for any and every good quality which he possessed.

It is this last feature of Father Grisar's volumes which has won for them the praise of Protestants, especially the Lutherans themselves. Of course they have not accepted his final verdict; that could hardly have been expected. But nearly all their scholars admit with Harnack "the immense knowledge, the critical spirit, and the spirit of fairness" of Father Grisar. So impartial was he that some Catholics did not receive his great work with the enthusiasm which it deserved; they were afraid that in his efforts to be fair, he had gone too far, that he had whitewashed Luther. A study of the volumes and a comparison of them with the general subject will show the falsity of such fears. Rather it will be evident that Grisar only rejected or questioned time-honored accusations against Luther when the materials compelled him

to regard the charges as false, improbable, or at the least, doubtful.

A few quotations from Protestant reviewers will help in the realization of the value of Grisar's Luther. The *Athenaeum* of London thus greeted the first volume, "His (Luther's) most elaborate and systematic biography . . . is not merely a book to be reckoned with; it is one with which we cannot dispense, if only for the minute examination of Luther's theological writings." Of the second volume the same journal had this to say, "The second volume of Dr. Grisar's 'Life of Luther' is fully as interesting as the first. There is the same minuteness of criticism and the same width of survey." The *Yorkshire Post* pays the following excellent tribute, "Another volume of Father Grisar's 'Life of Martin Luther' . . . confirms the belief that it will remain the standard 'Life' and rank amongst the most valuable contributions to the history of the Reformation."

About four years ago, Father Grisar brought out a one-volume life of the "Reformer." Many people, indeed many students, could not afford the time necessary to digest the great work; so for their benefit this single volume was produced. It was not a mere summary of the larger work, nor a mere collection of extracts, but a study distinct in itself, containing much that was new concerning Luther which recent scholarship had discovered. Both the greater and the smaller life, let it be noted, are not only historical accounts of the Saxon heretic's career, but deep and sane psychological studies of the heresiarch's peculiar and difficult character. And he is one of the greatest psychological puzzles of history. Thus Father Grisar was a pioneer in this method of biographical treatment long before those blessed words "psychological study" were in common misuse.

Besides these two lives of Luther, the pen of this learned German priest gave to students many other studies in the form of brochures, monographs, and treatises on various aspects of Luther or special phases of the Protestant Reformation, all of which have raised him to the highest rank as a leading modern authority on the Religious Revolt of the Sixteenth Century.

The field of Church historical tradition owes much to Father Grisar for his studies and publications. Indeed, his lecture, "Church History and the Critical Spirit," given before the Scientific Congress at Munich in September, 1900, is famous. In it, Father Grisar clearly and truly lays down the principles which should guide Catholics in investigating certain Catholic historical traditions. It was the citing of certain examples in his lecture, notably the Holy House of Loreto, which caused a perfect storm of bitter controversy to arise over the ideas of this learned priest. Father Grisar's words, if quoted as he gave them, could give no cause of offense. His very words were "that even if the difficulties raised against the history and authenticity of the Holy House of Loreto should prove well founded, no inference could be lawfully drawn therefrom to the prejudice of our Holy Catholic Faith." It is only just to add that throughout his whole life, Hartmann Grisar had the most tender devotion to Our Blessed Mother; his motivating force was to render her homage.

Personally, Father Grisar was small in stature and ascetical looking. He was always the perfect gentleman, always the soul of kindness, having a most pleasant smile and patient attention for every visitor or historical inquirer. One of the greatest pleasures of his declining years was the financial assistance which he received from an American friend to enable him to publish the third edition of his masterpiece, which publication seemed impossible in the hard times of post-War Germany. The pleasure this kindness afforded him was equaled only by his touching gratitude. Catholics of all nations may well cherish the name of Father Grisar as one of the Church's most loyal sons and one of her greatest historians.

Sociology

The Mooney Case

JOHN WILBYE

IN his letter announcing his refusal of a pardon to Tom Mooney, the Governor of California affirms nothing but his own good faith. But that is not in question.

The radical press claims that the Supreme Court of California, which reviewed the Mooney case four times, and the four Governors who have declined to pardon Mooney, were influenced by corrupt motives. Much underground rumor supports this contention. But of evidence, there has been none. Until facts that can stand up under examination are brought out into the open, fair-minded men will disregard the radical claim.

Yet it cannot be denied that "the refusal of Governor Rolph to pardon Mooney leaves a certain feeling of disquiet." That is the editorial opinion of the *New York Times*, a journal that has never been accused of radical proclivities. Governor Rolph's letter does not allay "the anxieties" which, the *Times* points out, "this notorious case has aroused." Nor does that part of the statement, prepared by the Governor's advisers, which was carried by the Associated Press on April 22. Mooney was not tried as "a man known to all Californians to be a Red and an anarchist." He was tried for murder. Any other charges are as irrelevant to the issue which the Governor was examining as the undoubted fact that the prisoner's name is Thomas.

It is only fair, however, to await publication of all the evidence on which Governor Rolph based his decision. Even if the two chief witnesses against Mooney have been shown to be perjurers, it is still possible that there was a residuum of truth in their statements, sufficient to justify Mooney's conviction.

But Governor Rolph must show us that residuum.

In 1917, at the instance of President Wilson, the Secretary of Labor made an examination of the Mooney case. The Secretary's report asserted that "a solid basis exists for the feeling that an injustice was done in the convictions that have been obtained."

Governor Rolph must overturn that solid basis.

One year later, after an investigation conducted for the Federal Bureau of Labor, John B. Densmore declared

that the State's case against Mooney, "has melted steadily away until there is little left but an unsavory record of manipulation and perjury."

Governor Rolph must show that the case of the State rests on a basis of strict justice.

Judge Franklin Griffin sat at the trial which ended with Mooney's conviction. Fourteen years later, when the perjury of Oxman had been demonstrated and McDonald had been repudiated, Judge Griffin summed up his conclusions in emphatic language. "The Mooney case is one of the dirtiest jobs ever put over, and I resent the fact that my court was used for such a contemptible piece of work," he wrote. "Every witness who testified against Mooney has been shown by facts and circumstances developed since the trial, and which are incontrovertible, to have testified falsely. There is now no evidence against him; there is not a serious suggestion that any exists."

Will Governor Rolph let the world know the evidence which led him to reject the conclusion reached by the judge before whom the Mooney case was tried?

Eleven of the original jurors who voted a conviction are still living. Of these eleven men who heard all the testimony that could be alleged against Mooney, ten have signed a petition asking that Mooney be pardoned. They are convinced that their decision was a miscarriage of justice.

What evidence can Governor Rolph adduce to show that these jurors are in error?

Finally, in July, 1931, the Wickersham Commission reported that "the failure of judicial remedies in the case was shocking to one's sense of justice." The Commission stated plainly that "there was never any scientific attempt to discover the perpetrators of the crime," for which Mooney was sentenced to die. It asserted that the State's investigation was "a hunt for evidence" to convict Mooney and Billings after a private detective agency had made out a case for their arrest, rather than a search for the culprits guilty of the bombing. More damning was the Commission's indictment of the manner in which the case was conducted by the district attorney. The Commission did not hesitate to write that the State coached witnesses "to a degree that approximated subordination of perjury," that it withheld from the defense evidence in its possession tending to discredit these witnesses, and that it used them under circumstances which "made their production a vouching for perjury."

Since Governor Rolph accepted the challenge of Mooney's defenders by agreeing to review the case, it is plainly incumbent upon him to show that no substantial injustice was done Mooney before or during the trial. The charges made by the Secretary of Labor, by John B. Densmore, by Judge Griffin, and by the Wickersham Commission, were made with full knowledge of their serious character. They cannot be swept away by a mere opinion signed by Governor Rolph or by his advisers. Granting the sincerity and good faith of the Governor, the same respect must be accorded to those who, publicly and with a sense of their responsibility, have stated their conviction that Mooney received far less than justice.

At least one of the Governor's advisers has chosen to

denounce Fremont Older, the San Francisco editor, Mayor Walker, of New York, Frank P. Walsh, and others who have taken part in Mooney's defense. Equally regrettable is his harping, in his report, on the fact that large sums of money have been contributed by radical and Communistic societies to keep this case before the public. All that is wholly irrelevant. Worse, it makes confidence in the impartiality of the Governor and his advisers impossible, and strengthens the belief, already firm and widespread in this country, that Mooney is kept in prison solely on account of his economic and political beliefs.

"Crime is rampant in this country, and public officials must be supported in their efforts to check and punish it. But God forbid that we ever forget the least canon of justice in dealing with the prisoner at the bar. That way lies the destruction of the authority of Almighty God, the Fount of all justice." I wrote those words some three months ago, in connection with a brief resume of the Mooney case. I repeat them here with misgivings, not of their truth, but of the material justice of the decision which was reached last week by the Governor of California.

I cannot think that the Mooney case is ended. I do not know that the man is innocent, but with thousands of Americans I cannot persuade myself that he was given a fair trial. Perhaps the unpublished parts of the evidence put before the Governor by his advisers might remove that and other "anxieties." Perhaps they might satisfy us that from the outset of this famous case the State was constantly mindful of its duty under God, the source and sanction of justice, to safeguard the least rights of Tom Mooney, now a prisoner for life behind the bars at San Quentin.

If that evidence is obtainable, let us have it.

Education

The Glorified American Infant

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

I HAD identified him with the Stout Gentleman in one of Washington Irving's potboilers (yes, he wrote a few!) when he cleared his throat. "Will you kindly read this, Sir," he rumbled, as with a Sir Roger de Coverly manner he passed me a magazine, "and favor me with your opinion." And since the printer will not help me out, I may tell you that his very intonation restored the lost "u" to "favor."

It was a dreary, rain-swept country through which the accommodation was dragging us, and any interruption promised the possibility of a pleasing vista. The page on which the Stout Gentleman desired my opinion was one of many making up an erudite article by a Dutch Doctor of Philosophy, and the general theme was the raising of children. Too many parents, wrote the Doctor, were in the toils of a delusion to which he fixed a learned name, and which I have forgotten. But the delusion itself was familiar enough: it consisted in denying the fact that now and then Johnny and Elizabeth May need a spanking as well as caresses.

Next week these research men will stumble over the multiplication table; and I said as much to the Stout Gentleman. But I am wondering when these deluded parents will come out of the mist, and what the schools can do to help them.

From one point of view, it is rather a disarming delusion. It usually envelops fathers and mothers who have had a hard childhood. They look back to days of deprivation, perhaps to nights of hunger. When other little boys and girls went to the circus, they had to stay at home, and for the rest of the summer, bear up under the slings and arrows hurled by companions who, even as we their elders, often made poverty and want synonymous with disgrace. They went to school in patched clothes, and perhaps these patches kept them from Sunday school or church, for their sad hearts were already too full to bear with the cruelty which most children unwittingly inflict upon one another. Possibly, too, these parents recall something that is worse than want of food and pretty dresses—the knowledge that many of the hardships which made their childhood a bitter thing came because of shiftless or unworthy parents. Happy indeed the man, and blessed the woman, whose childhood memories are woven of love! Theirs is a heritage more precious than rubies and much gold.

With a flock of their own about their knees, they are determined that these lambs shall feed always in green pastures by running brooks. My children, they say, as long as they are children, shall want for nothing. Even if father and mother go hungry and threadbare, they must have the best. They must be clothed even as the sons and daughters of the local capitalist. Their amusements, including visits to school chums, parties, and attendance at a summer camp, must be the first charge upon a scanty income. Johnny and Elizabeth May soon come to believe—indeed, are encouraged to believe—that they have only to ask to receive.

Now my theme is not so much of parents who have plenty, as of parents who must anxiously count every penny. There are no parents of that kind, you say? Then I fear you are neither a married man nor a schoolmaster, but a crusty, purblind old bachelor. There are far too many; I can look about me and count without much trouble plenty of fifty-dollar-per-week parents with five-hundred-dollar-per-week children. This misplaced benevolence is giving the children an evil preparation for the rebuffs of an unkind world which yields no man what he does not sweat for. They are neither wise nor parental, these parents, but stupid and cruel.

The evil is not seldom augmented by the softness which characterizes primary and secondary education in this country. We who first fought and played with Tom Brown at Rugby nearly fifty years ago remember how we thanked our stars that we lived under a gentler dispensation, for even then Latin and Greek verses at nine, along with the bangs, blows, cuffs, and canings of Rugby, had disappeared from American schools. Whether our English cousins still retain the cuffs and caning, I cannot say, but English schoolboy stories would indicate that Dr. Johnson's views have not been wholly repudiated.

"Sir, my master whipt me very well," said the sage to Mr. Langton who had asked the source of his singular mastery of Latin. "Without that, Sir, I should have done nothing. A child is afraid of being whipt and gets his task, and there is an end on't." We need not wholly adopt the Lexicographer's theory, but we can agree that "there is less flogging in our great schools than formerly, but then, less is learned there," at least, in our schools. At one extreme you have the school which whips the child to his task, and at the other the child which whips the school to find something which he will condescend to do.

In an account of a teachers' meeting, published in the London *Times* for April 2, I find a solemn criticism of this least-resistance policy in American schools. Discussing the general topic of self government, Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, formerly headmaster of Perse School, Cambridge, thought that one form which had been "carried to excess in American schools was to give the pupil his choice of subjects." Sporting with this insanity in a somewhat ponderous manner, Dr. Rouse said that if left to himself the pupil would probably elect a course in motor cycles or in wireless sets—in blissful ignorance of the fact that sometimes the American boy is permitted to elect scene painting, brass beating, or the manufacture of hats, while his sister is engaged with studies which will fit her for applying mud-packs and henna in a beauty parlor. But, counters the Dominie, with true British doggedness, "the real choice must be made by the guide, in the light of his wide experience, and his control must not be withdrawn until the training is complete."

It is easy to perceive that the Doctor still flounders in the woad-and-fen period of Hengist and Horsa. Yet even in this advanced age, some flounder with him. In the course of a radio debate with Waldo Frank some weeks ago McAlister Coleman damned American elementary schools as so many laboratories for futile experimentation. The chief result of all their expensive pother, he thought, has been "the glorification of the American infant," and the pronouncements of these experimenters "sound as though they had been written by their eight-year-old pupils." As a result of imbibing this "synthetic gin," pedagogues gravely inform us that "six-year-old Ethelbert is to be treated as a rounded personality, to whose opinions on life we are duly to defer."

It is easy to belabor the school, and from the days of Job the schoolmaster has been a target for scorn. They have their undeniable faults, but I believe that with a bit of encouragement from parents, they would walk on paths of reform, and put Ethelbert where he belongs. Contrariwise, I also believe that with a bit of encouragement from plain-spoken schools, some parents too would reform, and put Ethelbert on a new diet and regimen. An alive parent-teacher association is an excellent means of interesting parents in a school; under competent guidance it is an even better means of teaching parents something of their work as parents. If it is the privilege of every parent to show the school wherein it fails, the school should make it a never-neglected duty to inform parents wherein they can do better. When Elizabeth May comes to school, arrayed as a glorified infant in

purple and fine linen, for instance, let Miss Pinkerton or Reverend Mother forthwith convey an indictment to those guilty of the outrage, and summon a hanging assize.

There are such Miss Pinkertons and Reverend Mothers. They understand that these offending parents are not criminals, but, rather, soft-hearted dolts. Their chief interest is the child, and that is why they do not shrink from administering bitter draughts as often as necessary to the elder children. Both are to be cherished, but now and then each needs a spanking. When parents are afraid of being whipt, perhaps they too will get their tasks, and, to paraphrase Dr. Johnson, there will be an end of fathers and mothers who by pampering their children work for their ruin, here and hereafter.

With *Scrip* and *Staff*

THE terrible task of cutting down expenses, remodeling budgets, deferring building programs, in countless educational institutions in this country, will at least have the advantage of directing the attention of educators to the purposes of education. In his inaugural address at the opening in October of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, in Milan, the Rector, the famous convert, Father Augustine Gemelli, O.F.M., inquired into the age-old question of the reasons for existence of a university. "Today," he said, "the world is tormented" by this question: "What should a university accomplish? Should the growing economic difficulties cause them to restrict their sphere of activities, leaving to happier times the resumption of their wider scope?"

"Unrest," says Gemelli, is the characteristic of our epoch. "It is the characteristic note, essentially constitutive of the modern soul, a manifestation at the same time of the limitations and the greatness of our mental powers and the fragility and the greed of our hearts. . . . The esthetic or psychological analyses of a Nietzsche or a D'Annunzio, the theoretic concepts of an Einstein or an Eddington, the inventive triumphs of an Edison or a Marconi have resulted only in the increase of this disquiet of a soul. . . . There are innumerable names for it, innumerable explanations. . . . Man is never satisfied with himself."

"In the last analysis it comes down to the hunger for God. There is no cure but to return to the primacy of the spiritual life: to worship God and Him alone."

OUT of this unrest has grown the insistent questioning as to whether the university should not take on a new orientation, and devote itself to purely "practical" ends. With all due regard, however, to the practical needs of the time, Gemelli combats this idea as contrary to the true mission of higher learning; which is fundamentally in the field of pure knowledge and ideals.

Let me repeat the idea which I have so often expressed in this very hall. The periods of true greatness of Italian national life have always been those in which, alongside of other expressions of national greatness, there has been a greater development of university life. A philosopher, who works out a doctrine which is the expression of the thought of an age; a devotee of theoretic science, who builds up a general law of nature by piling up fact

upon fact; an intelligence which scrutinizes the past and derives therefrom a more complete vision of the world and reproduces for us the language of past generations and past occurrences; an artist, who can sum up in a symbol the collective expression of a nation's soul, brings about a more intense rate of progress than can be done by thousands of technicians working in the most diversified fields. Research has life and fruitfulness only in so far as it is the expression of an idea.

Even in times of economic crisis, he observes, even in times when we are hemmed in by every form of inconvenience, it is not a luxury to make it possible for properly trained men to work out doctrines and formulae.

WHAT, then, is the function of Catholic learning? First of all, notes Gemelli, it is to combat the basic error of our times, which is the exaltation of man and the forgetfulness of God. The result of this exaltation is a perverted moral concept:

Among the intellectuals and the pseudo-intellectuals and children of the world today there prevails a certain esthetic conscience (*coscienza estetica*), which is the negation of the Christian concept of sin. Far too frequently it contemplates with the same benevolent indulgence vice and virtue, as two equally interesting aspects of reality. It has no condemnation for guilt. It is indifferent in the presence of austere morality, and considers it rather as an expression of weakness. It admires every form of greatness, such as the greatness of a tenacious, bold will, wheresoever and howsoever it manifests itself, whether it be in an ordinary adventurer, in a genius, or in a saint. It admires distinction of outline, whether it be good or bad, just so long as it is distinguished. It allows men to commit fraud as long as they do it skilfully; to offend, if they do it with courtesy; to lie, if they use the inventiveness of a genius. This refined esthetic conscience, when its turns its admiration to manifestations of self-will and shrewdness, develops such an immoral and anti-Christian spirit that in the end it coincides with that ignorant and callous conscience that has no other aim in life save material gain or sensual pleasures, whose criterion for judging things is success, which sees right only in might. In a word, it tends directly to the grossly materialistic and purely economic concept of life.

Abraham Flexner, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for April, recalls the strong individualities of the scholars who, with Gilman, laid the foundations of John Hopkins University: Goodwin, Child, Hadley, Gibbs, and others. He deplores the leveling process caused by the "influx of degree hunters," and by the "creation of merely technical schools," as a cause of the failings of our American graduate schools. Yet Catholic higher learning, which centers in God and not in man, stands foremost today in upholding the value of the individual educator, rather than of the system. Witness the tutorial plan, for honor undergraduates, recently demonstrated at St. Peter's College, Jersey City.

THE words in which Gemelli sums up the advantages possessed by Catholic scholarship form a fitting supplement to Father O'Donnell's convincing reply to a recent slur on the intellectual achievements of the University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame, it will be recalled, has not only proved herself outstanding in the field of chemical, electrical, and industrial research, thus proving Gemelli's point as to the practical value, in the long run, of theoretic pursuits. Not only has she won particular fame by her English department, but she is linked up, as Father

O'Donnell reminds us, with Italian scholarship by possessing one of the best Dante libraries in the world and her splendid Italian art collection.

Says Gemelli:

Every mind free from scholastic prejudices . . . should recognize that the Catholic scholar has, of himself, one great advantage . . . which guarantees for him the attainment of his goal, irrespective of the time that it takes him to attain it. He attacks the study of problems from the Divine and supernatural point of view. This point of view is the means of acquiring a universal enlightenment. Everyone of our ideas has God behind it and before it. If it is true that general principles shed abundant light on particular researches, it is specially true that an incomparable light is shed by the first Principle. The man whose vision cannot rise to God, no matter how deeply it may penetrate, has only a limited view. The man who cannot look at things from God's point of view, no matter how far his eye may roam, has a restricted horizon.

Gemelli himself recalls Newman's words, in which he sees the mission of a Catholic university in restoring peace to a troubled world by its pointing out the true paths of progress.

THE PILGRIM.

LAMPS

Now it is late and time to close
The Capuchins' Saint Francis church.
A few insistent worshippers are still
In shadowed pews, with eyes intent
Upon the lights that pierce the darkness of the place:
The faithful flame before the tabernacle door,
The vigil lamps where she serenely stands,
A Virgin powerful and Mother mild,
And where Saint Anthony of Padua
Is privileged to hold her Child.

Then Brother Boniface begins to move,
A gentle, bearded Capuchin,
Among the votive lamps that fling
Their flames against the darkness of the place;
Their flames that mount, then droop,
Like hearts of those who linger in the shadowed pews.
He gathers up the lamps burnt out,
And in his arms he holds them gently tight:
He seems a shepherd with his flock embraced
Against the terrors of the night.

When Brother Boniface walks down the aisle
In Capuchins' Saint Francis church,
With flameless lamps against his breast,
It seems to me the lamps are like the lives of men,
Like the lives of which the flames are dead
That flickered briefly.

And some burnt red with passion's fire,
And some were yellow with the glow of greed;
Or green with envy and small bitterness,
Or purple with the wine of pride and cruelty.
But only those that burnt with whiteness at the end,
But only those that burnt all colored dross away,
Shall burn again where burning seraphs bend.

When Brother Boniface, late in the shadowed place,
Not hastily but with an humble, guileless grace,
Walks down the aisle at last to cell and rest,
With lamps like rescued sheep against his chest,
I would my lamp of life were finally all white
And safe against His breast of mercy in the night.

FRANCIS WHITEHILL.

Back of Business

INFLATION is the issue of the day. We know that inflation is any artificial stimulus of the natural laws of supply and demand. If I borrow \$100, I "inflate" my buying power. At the height of the so-called prosperity of 1927 to 1929, this country went through a very substantial credit "inflation." With the \$100 I borrow, I burden my future earnings; so, they really "deflate" my financial condition. The national credit inflation soon led to the Wall Street crash and deflated the whole country. We are still in the midst of deflation.

Briefly, there is, in the long run, no such thing as "inflation"; in the end it is always "deflation." It is a narcotic and invariably throws you back because, once started, it cannot be stopped before it has run its full damaging course. Some advise the issue of more money; but while the people have lost billions of dollars since 1929, our currency has actually been enlarged by nearly a billion. We have an abundance of "money"; the banks are filled to the rim. I know of at least four large banks which are in the market for the investment of many millions of dollars. But whatever they are offered, it is not sound enough. Manufacturers are working almost without a profit; the security they offer either is rapidly losing in value, or cannot be considered marketable, and so on.

Then, again, prices drop steadily and our debts are rising proportionately. "Stop the price decline through inflation," we are advised. It should not be done; if we have inflation, we have rising prices; if we have rising prices, we have rising production, and start depression all over again. What we owe to each other, the manufacturer to the banker, the carpenter to the mortgage-and-loan association, and so on, must be deflated because we cannot pay the entire amount, variously estimated as between 100 and 150 billion dollars. A good part of it *must* be written off if we want sound conditions. The banks are writing off bad and questionable accounts.

If the veterans' bonus were paid, this would be inflation. No doubt the Government could borrow the \$2,400,000,000 if this were all. But it is not. The money would be spent within a few months, then we would hear the human cry for "more." The veterans want the bonus because they need it. If it is not the bonus, it will be something else. The Federal Reserve started purchasing Government securities. This has not helped anybody, not even Wall Street, though it is an inflationary measure. But within a year or so, we might see the following effect: there will be a good market for Government securities, Federal, State, county, and city. They will be able to place some more bond issues and, naturally, will be in a position where they can indulge in more wasteful expenditure.

It is regrettable that there should be so much talk about inflation. It is, from the point of sound economics, exactly the opposite to the requirements of the day. We should by all means go through with deflation even if it meant the dole. Unfortunately, human psychology is not far-sighted; it therefore tends to walk the rosy-looking path of inflation, in spite of logic and common sense.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

Literature**Perfectionism—A Reply?**

S. N. LITHE

THE article "Perfectionism—A Catholic Fallacy?" by Francis X. Connolly in AMERICA for April 2 touches a most important problem and goes more nigh to the matter (in Blessed John Fisher's phrase) than any I have read for a long time. May I, as a Catholic writer to whom the question is of great practical importance, venture my views in the belief that they cover difficulties shared by many others.

I have chosen the profession of letters not primarily as a means of acquiring riches, or prosperity, or fame. I am, I think, sufficiently convinced of the fallacy that riches in themselves are worth working for, to be free of that sort of ambition. If I were not, I have the warning of the large percentage of suicides amongst millionaires to deter me. I have no desire to die that way. Also, my Catholic philosophy warns me of the weight of the burden of using one's riches properly. That is terrifying. As for fame, common-sense and a knowledge of history tell me that it is a great gamble. It is a lottery in which I do not deny the thrill of holding a ticket, nor am I unconscious of my responsibility in the application of the winnings, if any, to proper purposes.

In short, I regard the profession of letters as a vocation to which I am called, and being called, cannot refuse to answer. I find what appears to me to be evil all around me, evil flourishing on its own account and evil attacking what seems to me to be good. Such knowledge of the world, of human nature, and of its history as has been given to me, is my guide in distinguishing between good and evil. So far as I can judge with the apparatus that has been given to me, the standards of good and evil are to be found in the Catholic Faith and Catholic philosophy. For other reasons, beyond the present discussion, I believe that Faith and philosophy to be Divinely inspired (and on that account also a safe guide to what is good, true, and just), to be opposed to the evil I am bound to attack.

I say *attack*, because my attitude is not so much one of defense of truth or of the Catholic Faith, which does not need the feeble defense that I might give it. Therefore, I do not regard myself as an apologist; if I make use of any form of apologetics it is as a weapon of attack rather than defense. I am not fit to defend what is good, but I am bound to attack what is evil. My chief guide to what is evil is the teaching of the Church.

Now, after this preamble, we come to the difficulties and the problems bound up in the suggested dangers of "perfectionism." The matter touches me closely as I think it must touch a great many in my position. I must choose my weapons for the fight. In the first place, I may choose the weapon of direct attack of evil action and evil propaganda, showing why it is evil and contrasting it with its contrary good. In this attack I must make sure of my facts so that I do not misstate the nature of the evil attacked nor the good proposed as an alternative.

Otherwise, though I am quite right, the enemy may be able to make it appear that I am wrong, because I state the case wrongly. Therefore, theoretically, I am bound to make sure that I know all there is to know about the subject. I may not take risks. Is this perfectionism? Theoretically, yes; practically, no. Obviously I cannot follow out this principle every time, if indeed at any time. I must do the best I can with the time and other means at my disposal. Therefore, I have a working motto: "The man who never made a mistake never made anything." So I get on with the job, and, by the grace of God, I usually get away with it.

But this, you will say, is not a case to which "perfectionism" applies, because I stop short of perfectionism. On the contrary I do not. I have the weapons which *apparently* "perfectionism" hinders me in using or deters me altogether from using. In addition to direct attack, there is a sort of oblique attack on evil. Where I have found the work of other writers misinterpreted, mistranslated, or ignored, I have undertaken to reinterpret, retranslate and resuscitate the works in question. Where I have found history badly written and wrongly interpreted, I have rewritten it in an attempt to do it better, show the truth of the matter, and so confound the other side. Most of my books have been of this nature. I have impudently butted into fields of scholarship for which I was, according to current standards, quite ill-equipped. The fact that I have got away with it, even on the admission of the other side, vindicates not so much my action as the justice of my case, which can win in spite of my deficiencies. I have been greatly concerned in mind at these deficiencies, at the risks I take, and at the imperfections in my finished work.

But since I do take the plunge, trusting in God, you may say that the fallacy of perfectionism does not apply to my case. On the contrary it does. Just as with the first weapon of direct attack it deterred me from attacking more and bigger fry, so in the oblique method it deters me from attempting works of greater importance, scope, and effect. But "perfectionism" is not by any means wholly responsible, as we shall see.

There is a third method of attack which I want to adopt and which appears to be even more hampered by perfectionism—that is, in the field of creative work. I want to write fiction, prose and verse, that will attack bad work in that field by beating it on its own ground. I want to do creative work in literature that will be free from the evils that I attack and be preferred to the work of the enemy on grounds of literary quality. The only way to beat evil literature is to write good literature *better*. Is that why, as Mr. Connolly suggests, the shortage of Catholic achievement is greater in this field than in any other? It would seem to be so. In my opinion and experience there is a greater hindrance but for which the obstacle of perfectionism would be largely overcome and reduced to negligible proportions. I think the vast majority of Catholic writers and scholars who are deterred from literary achievement by what appears to be perfectionism are far more deterred in fact by the economic factor.

For example, in the first of my lines of attack I overcome my reluctance to fall short of perfection more than I do in my second, and in the second more than in the third. I am content with the bare necessities of subsistence. But I must eat to live, however simply, or I cannot write. I find that there is some market for my short polemical writings, a very bad one in the Catholic press of my own country, England, a better one in America. In England the public is smaller, the publications less in number and the editors fewer and (I think) less progressive and more timid. Still, if I write a short article and fail to sell it, or sell it for too little, my loss in time is small compared with the period taken over a historical work, and the return on short articles is quicker and meets immediate needs. More substantial works involve greater labor and are less remunerative.

When it comes to the third class of work the risk is far greater. The market for fiction is so flooded that good work, even of a very high order, is frequently swamped and very inferior work frequently achieves enormous success, as anyone with half an eye can see. When it comes to poetry, which may, and nearly always does, demand unrestricted labor and time, there is, practically speaking, no market, except by rare chance—so that it must be entirely a spare-time labor, free from economic pressure.

Can we wonder then that "very honest and learned gentlemen with intellectual maturity," continue to labor steadily in the field of pedagogy or elsewhere, maintaining their small economic security, and do not plunge into the cold and stormy sea of letters? Can one wonder that the output of those who do so plunge is limited when they realize, as such as I do, the necessity for a high standard of competence, and yet they have not, as such as I have, the spur of economic necessity to help them to overcome their scruples?

It is true, of course, that one should be prepared to sacrifice economic considerations in this fight. But outside the profession of letters few understand the conditions within it, so accurately described by Hilaire Belloc in his essay "On Writing as a Trade," in "Conversations with a Cat" (or with an Angel, I forget which). If one earns one's living otherwise, literary output must be comparatively small and the temptation to perfectionism greater. Personally I have felt that that would not be enough. In my attempt to extend the field of Catholic letters, what is my position? I make bold to quote my own example, under the shelter of anonymity. Beyond the admitted masters of the profession, I doubt whether there are a score, or at most two-score, writers out of the Catholic millions of the English-speaking peoples who earn sufficient by their work to enable them to give their ability anything like full scope. My own case is by no means exceptional. I have had published some dozen literary and historical works that have been well received by Catholic and non-Catholic critics alike. I have contributed a good deal to the leading Catholic journals in the English-speaking world and to practically every London daily newspaper, as well as to leading literary publications. I have been much more fortunate in this re-

spect than my contemporaries, who consider me successful. Yet in spite of most frugal living in which there are no luxuries (I forbear to harrow my readers with the privations) it is with very great difficulty that I manage to pay my way and contribute a little to the support of my dependents.

Outside the profession, even as close to it as the publishing and editorial spheres, this condition appears to be almost incredible. Within the profession it is recognized as all too common. I know many better and more able men than myself who are even worse off. Perhaps the chief disadvantage of this condition is the damage to one's work by the anxiety it involves and the practical obstacles it opposes to the approach to perfection.

Just as this condition hinders me from work I want to do (and proved I can do by small examples), it must also deter many others who appear to take refuge in perfectionism, though their real obstacle is the economic factor. One cannot say the masterpieces might be attempted as a sideline—you may *have* to go the whole hog once you start. I venture to suggest so far as the professional scribblers like myself are concerned, if by some miracle the economics of the trade could be changed, even a little, there would not be much cause to complain of the vice of perfectionism.

REVIEWS

The Permanent Bases of Foreign Policy. By JULES CAMBON, SIR AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, RICHARD VON KUHLMANN, and JOHN W. DAVIS. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.

Here are four essays which state with lucidity and force the foreign policies of four great nations. M. Cambon tells us what we all know, that the one great concern of France is security. "It is true," he says, "that by the Briand-Kellogg Pact most of the nations have solemnly renounced war, but in 1914 how little the most solemn engagements were worth when the German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, declared that necessity knows no law! We, therefore, are under compulsion to neglect nothing which can guarantee us against the danger of war." And security must be understood in its fullest sense. It signifies more "than the maintenance of a people's homeland, or even of their territories beyond the seas. It also means the maintenance of the world's respect for them, the maintenance of their economic interest, everything, in a word, which goes to make up the grandeur, the life itself, of the nation." In an historic sketch, M. Cambon shows how France has pursued this aim with consistency and moderation, Napoleon being but a passing exception. From Sir Austen Chamberlain we learn that, as far as the British can formulate anything, the aim of the British Empire is security. "To give France her Concert but to keep our security" were the words by which Lord Castlereagh described the aim of British policy. Substitute Germany for France and the definition held good for his successors a century later. Today the League of Nations is the best security for British security. As for Germany, the principal claim of her foreign policy, as far as she may be said to have one, is to attain security. Herr von Kuhlmann quotes M. Cambon's words and says that it will be the permanent endeavor of the German Government, supported by the Reichstag, to win and maintain this security. This implies achievement of happy relations with France. America, according to Mr. Davis, is also chiefly engaged in the quest of security, an idea which embodies the characteristic American desire to be let alone. The fact that America is not oppressed by hostile armies on her frontiers, nor blockades on her coast, "does not make her foreign

policy any the less a search for security than that of Powers not so fortunate." There is something monumental in these four declarations. One feels that if the relations of great Powers could be left to great statesmen there would be security for all and danger for none. But not one of these great statesmen has explained how security for the rest of the world is to be achieved if the security of each of these nations is adequately provided for.

J. L. F.

Drawn from Life. By S. J. WOOLF. New York: McGraw-Hill. \$5.00.

For many years, Mr. Woolf has been hunting the great and the near great through New York, Washington, Berlin, Paris, and Rome, and has been writing down his interviews. Statesmen and authors, painters and poets, financiers and scientists, form the long procession of those of whom he has written and also drawn his impressions. It is really a very comprehensive list, and one that throws many new and intimate sidelights upon illustrious personages, known usually through newspaper notices alone. "I have," says Mr. Woolf, "found the taciturn Coolidge talkative, the domineering Mussolini docile, the satiric Shaw sympathetic. The cold, cruel ex-Crown Prince of Germany has been kindly and humorous; and Einstein, remote and absorbed in theories, has dunked his coffee in homely style before me." Those who are already familiar with the author's articles in the *New York Times*, as well as with his drawings, will not need to be assured that this is a volume of personalities which is extremely interesting in content, and of real artistic worth, even though many a reader will not accept the evolutionary hypotheses enunciated by some of those interviewed as the explanation of religion. The content, the binding, the paper, the drawings, all tend to make this book an excellent companion for an idle hour, or a beautiful gift for a cultured friend. Among the gallery, appraised here and literally "drawn from life" are Mark Twain, Alfred Smith, Paul Claudel, Robert Millikan, Nicholas Murray Butler, Clemenceau, Borah, Churchill, Paderewski, Schwab, Pershing, Chesterton, Franklin Roosevelt, Booth Tarkington, and Colonel Lindbergh. F. D.

The Evidence for Immortality. By DON P. HALSEY. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

In this book Judge Halsey reveals himself as a man of some noble ideals. Because personal immortality is so important for morals, religion, and life, he wishes to present its evidences to the general reader. The first eight chapters will give Catholics considerable joy, for despite some errors and overworked comparisons their sound matter is identical with Scholastic thought, and they contain many things Catholics wish more widely known. The style is delightfully vivacious, readable, and untechnical. No clear concept is shown of the spirituality of the soul. Hence we are little surprised that while the first origin of life is ascribed to the Personal, Intelligent, Infinite, and Just God, the origin of the human soul is explained by the recapitulation theory of evolution, and that immortality is conceded to brute as well as to men. Although the pieces of evidence might be more closely woven together, they justify the author's conclusion that immortality is more probable than its opposite. But the succeeding chapters of confirmation from authority seem to do the author's cause little good. They may bewilder the general reader, and will appear unscholarly to the philosopher who knows the difference between pantheistic monism and Theistic dualism. Bruno, Spinoza, Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, Renan, Huxley, Tyndall, Herbert Spencer, Wordsworth, Emerson, William James, and others are presented as believers in God and the immortality of the individual. With little hesitation or qualification, the millennium before Roger Bacon is described as devoid of progress under the "domination of . . . the Papacy" (p. 90). Yet at all this, not anger so much as sympathetic regret overtakes us, for we realize the backgrounds and sources of Mr. Halsey's thought. He seems to have heard and read such things so often as never to suspect them worthy of investigation. We appreciate the difficulties of the non-Scholastic philosopher, armed with few criteria and confronted by a welter

of philosophical opinions in a busy life. Still, if Mr. Halsey had leisure to write such a book, could we not also ask him, as a fellow American and for the sake of scholarship and fairness, to read the Scholastic and Catholic side of some of these questions?

G. E. G.

George Washington. Soul of the Revolution. By NORWOOD YOUNG. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company. \$3.50.

Here is a newly arranged life of Washington written by an unfriendly biographer. A portrait, "Washington in his Prime," probably as inaccurate as it is unattractive, has been selected as a frontispiece. Dismissing the "hatchet and cherry tree" incident as a frivolous tale, Mr. Young accuses Washington of being capable of making "a statement designed to deceive" (p. 37), and casts doubt on his bravery, his veracity, and his fidelity to his fiancee. That America won the war of Independence was, according to Mr. Young, due not to the determined patriotism of Washington and his loyal associates, but to the indecision and petty jealousies of the Home Government and the field generals. According to this writer that "a third term" savored of "Caesarism" was not Washington's reason for declining the proffered dignity, and his serious warnings against engaging in foreign complications was not expressed in the words *entangling alliances*. Like every true Englishman, Mr. Young laments the loss of the Colonies, and longingly looking into the future sighs hopefully for the not too distant reunion of the whole English-speaking world in harmonious combination governing all things for themselves, and regulating the doings of the less favored members of the human family. Providence indeed, not however Divine, but a benign English Providence shall rule the world! Americans love humor; and what is more laughable than British stolidity soberly trying to ridicule Washington! The book contains eighteen illustrations. It closes with a "Chronology," an "Appendix," "Notes and References" and, finally, with an alphabetical "Index."

M. J. S.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Poetry.—"The Sonnets of Petrarch" (Longmans. \$2.50), translated by Joseph Auslander, achieves the task of presenting in English the charm of the 317 sonnets in which the Italian poet recorded the story of his hopeless wooing of Laura. Famous English poets from Chaucer down have put some of the sonnets into English verse, but Mr. Auslander is the first to translate the complete sequence. The ordinary handicaps of translation are here increased by the restricted nature of the theme and the rigid laws of the verse form, but they have been overcome with pleasing success, no labored effort marring the smooth flow of the verses and no feeling of artificiality clouding the expression of the varying emotions that rule the poet's heart.

A worthy contribution to our numerous collections of poems has been made by Frederick T. Wood in his "An Anthology of Augustan Poetry, 1700-1751" (Macmillan. \$3.00). In an introduction of sixty pages is provided an enlightening study of this period in literature as an approach to a proper appreciation of the poems contained in the volume, and besides a bibliography there is a list of Augustan works on poetry and poetic theory which will be useful to the student. Further help is supplied by arranging the poems not by authors nor by years but by their subjects, sections being headed "Love Poetry," "Life and Death," etc. While the verse of this period is not of the highest quality, it merits study as marking a definite phase in the development of English literature.

Jonathan Tree possesses in unusual degree the tools of the poet, an active imagination and ready skill in verse. In "Galilee and Points West" (Dial. \$1.50) however, a lack of intellectual penetration tends to vitiate a large part of his work; his mind is made fretful by the mysteries of Christianity. Like Alloch, the hero of the longer poem opening the volume, he seems to feel numbed and puzzled and to hear mocking laughter behind sacred scenes; he sees scorn even in the look that Christ casts from the cross on His faithful followers. More mature reflection may lead

him from such peevish pecking at great thoughts to the more poetic task of singing the hidden hopes of the human heart. In the lighter poems of this volume the poet shows to much greater advantage.

Education.—The purpose of "The Art of the Teacher" (Appleton. \$2.00) is indicated by the title: teaching is an art with a scientific aspect. It is well-planned, readable, and stimulating. Mr. P. E. Valentine assumes that modern educational method represents progress but is not blind to its chief danger, the substitution of technique and mechanics for teaching, which is the indispensable and artistic element. There is a quiet optimism and idealism pervading the book which would render it very beneficial to a young teacher at the end of a weary day of discouragement. The author avoids discussion of the practical value of experimental methods or devices while presenting the philosophical principles that underlie present, accepted methods in secondary schools. Critical readers will perhaps feel a certain lack of depth and decision in the treatment, but all in all, it is worth reading.

Frederick Lamson Whitney in "Methods in Educational Research" (Appleton. \$2.25) purports to give "A combined handbook and sourcebook for beginners and advanced groups in Educational Research." He presents in experiential order the successive steps in research from the selection of the problem to the writer's signature. To a beginner the book would be invaluable. To one conducting a course in educational research, it would be serviceable. In not too technical language, it presents all of the established general procedure without emphasizing the utterly new or experimental. It is calculated to aid one not engaged on a highly specialized problem requiring a singular mode of procedure. Adaptation would be necessary to other fields than education but the matter and arrangement being easy and typical, and the style readable, it might be used to advantage by a research beginner in any field.

The first two volumes of the "Psychology Series" edited by Professor Poffenberger of Columbia University, give promise of excellent summaries of the theoretical interpretation of experimental data. In "Contemporary Schools of Psychology" Professor Woodworth briefly reviews the claims of the Schools which he thinks show signs of vigorous vitality. The special merit of the book seems to be its pointed contrast of Behaviorism and Gestalt Psychology, and its close linkage of Psychoanalytic and Hormic Psychology. Professor Hollingworth has given some worth while discussion of the various explanations of mental abnormalities in the text "Abnormal Psychology." He suffers, however, from a common abnormality of psychologists of today. They will insist ad nauseam on classifying all psychological learning antedating the past century as Myth Psychology or Mysticism; and will emphatically urge their favorite theory, which happens in Professor Hollingworth's instance to be Redintegration.

Literature.—"Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe," (University of Pennsylvania Press. \$3.00) is an appropriate tribute by his students and collaborators to a life-long promoter and exemplifier of the languages and literature of Greece and Rome. Its eighteen erudite and interesting essays, presenting the pith and marrow of classic culture and customs and linguistic usage, make a helpful contribution to post-graduate work. The statement on page 309, that "aniconic worship has given way under the influence of a strong tendency to idolatry . . . in the Roman Catholic Church," is one of the few blemishes on a book which is creditable to American scholarship in achievement and in promise.

A collection of witty anecdotes about persons and things dating back to the Civil War is found in "Loquacities" (Appleton. \$2.50), by Charles Macomb Flandrau. There are reminiscences of hoop skirts, Roosevelt, and old St. Paul, with tales of Paris hotels and his own virtues as a housekeeper, all seasoned with the philosophy of a man who loves "old things" and enjoys a practical joke. Mr. Flandrau's experiences are those of a man intellectually alive and eager, and thoroughly cultured. He writes

with a winning egotism. Loquacities makes pleasant, smooth reading, truly a delightful book.

"Great Spanish Short Stories" sample the work of the leading Spanish writers of the day. Translated from the Spanish by Warre B. Wells, with biographical notes by J. G. Gorkin, and an introduction by Henri Barbusse. Fifteen stories, some good, some indifferent, one or two in bad taste.

Biography.—Mrs. C. N. Williamson, who will be remembered for her "Lightning Conductor," has recently published her autobiography. Calling it the "Inky Way," (Putnam. \$3.50) she writes of her rise from obscurity to fame and more particularly of the many friends she made during that period. She describes her meetings with many of the great contemporary statesmen and artists, giving a short account of her impressions of each. The sketches that impress one most are those of King Edward VII, of England, who drove to her country home expressly to meet Mr. and Mrs. Williamson; and David Lloyd George, whom they entertained in their Monte Carlo home. Particularly entertaining also are her impressions of the Great War, during which she labored in the Red Cross service. This autobiography, therefore, is interesting from the point of view of a social index of Europe, and from that of a well-written panorama of the times during a life that ran from the late nineteenth century down to our modern days.

"Portrait of an American" (Macmillan. \$2.00), by Robert P. Tristram Coffin, is a splendid story faithfully describing the intimate life of the genuine New England Yankee. His temper, ingenuity, ceaseless industry, and abounding health gain for him the natural reward of wholesome prosperity. The integrity of his moral habits is attested by a large group of children, each of whom, after the model of their sober and efficient parents, is taught and schooled to progress in ways best suited to their individual abilities and talents. Self-help, self-reliance, together with a deep and abiding unselfish interdependence between man and wife, and between parents and children, secured in time abundant fruits from the earth, and merited the blessings of heaven. There is no exaggeration in Mr. Coffin's "Portrait of an American." It is a simple story, simply and well told. The depression of today would be largely mitigated by a return to honest and independent toil, such as is vividly recounted in the pages of this book. Imitation of the Yankee's devotion to his large and growing family would put an end to the immoral practices which threaten the life of the Nation.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

- ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF ALIENS, THE. William C. Van Vleck. \$3.00. Commonwealth Fund.
- CHINESE FABLES AND FOLK STORIES. Mary Hayes Davis and Chow Leung. American Book Company.
- COURS DE RELIGION. E. Duplessy. 6 francs. Tequi.
- CRUSADE FOR THE ANEMONE. Princess Marthe Bibesco. \$2.00. Macmillan.
- GOLDEN CHAIN OF TRUTH, THE. Rev. F. Hendrichs, S.J. 1 shilling. Brepols' Catholic Press, Turnhout, Belgium.
- HEAT AND HEALTH. Frank Reh. American Book Company.
- HENRY VII'S RELATIONS WITH SCOTLAND AND IRELAND. 1485-1498. Agnes Conway. \$5.00. Macmillan.
- HITLER. Emil Lengyel. \$3.00. Dial.
- HOLD YER HOSSES! Bob Sherwood. \$2.50. Macmillan.
- INDIAN WARS OF IDAHO. R. Ross Arnold. \$2.50. Carlton.
- JOHN AND JEAN. Eloise Davis Pickard and Gladys Simpson. American Book Company.
- JUDY'S OCEAN VOYAGE. Doris Bernstein. American Book Company.
- KEEP GOING. Philip Christian. Published by the author at Winter Hill, Mass.
- KENSINGTON STONE, THE. Hjalmar R. Holand. \$3.00. Published by the author.
- LIFE OF ROBERT BURNS, THE. Franklyn Snyder. \$4.00. Macmillan.
- MANCHURIA, CRADLE OF CONFLICT. Owen Lattimore. \$3.00. Macmillan.
- RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF THE WHITE HOUSE. Vernon B. Hampton. \$3.00. Christopher.
- SOUTHERN URBAN NEGRO AS A CONSUMER, THE. Paul K. Edwards. \$5.00. Prentice-Hall.
- THOUGHTS ON GERMANY. Richard von Kühlmann. \$3.50. Macmillan.
- THUNDER AND DAWN. Glenn Frank. \$3.50. Macmillan.
- VIE MYSTIQUE DE SAINT PAUL, LA. Henri Morice. 10 francs. Tequi.
- WATER, AIR AND SOUND. Frank Reh. American Book Company.
- "WHITE BIRD" AND OTHER POEMS, THE. Gertrude Bartlett. \$1.50. Macmillan.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Hornets' Nest—Stirred

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Page 32 in the issue of AMERICA for April 16 contains the following sentence:

But the case of the Pharisees is valid only when they show that the rascal is a rascal because he has been faithful in every substantial point to the doctrines and exhortations of the Catholic Church.

This bit of horse-sense could well be read by the other writer (I would not have dared to call him a Pharisee) who on page 31 implies that politics is an unclean and indecent profession because of its black sheep. Can he show that the political "rascal is a rascal because he has been faithful in every substantial point to the doctrines" of the political profession?

Discouraging young Catholic Americans from taking their rightful places in the active politics of the nation suggests the role of the man who in war time goes around discouraging citizens from enlisting. An editorial such as your "An Unclean Profession" will do more to keep politics dirty than the energy of a dozen grafters and ward heelers.

The editorial writer might turn to page 457 of AMERICA for February 20, 1915 and read Governor David Walsh's statement,

The profession of politics . . . stands in a class entirely distinct from the commercial or self-centered professions, and in my judgment ranks second only to the priesthood among the callings of self-abnegation and service.

I appeal from AMERICA befuddled to AMERICA thinking.

Notre Dame University.

RICHARD G. CAHILL.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Pius XI, quoted in the *N. C. W. C. Review*, January, 1931, says that Catholic Action must not exclude political activity. He writes: "For what we wish is that Christ rule on earth as He rules in heaven, and that His kingdom over the world become effective."

Although your editorial, "An Unclean Profession," says that our elders knew more about politics than the rising generation because the elders concluded that politics was an indecent profession, it seems to me that the young folks in our colleges now can invoke Pius XI against both their elders and your editorial writer. The young folks of the nation are becoming interested in politics, while their elders by their absorption in money-grabbing and their example of neglect of civil duties have perverted omission of civil duties from the vice that it is into a respectable virtue. Your editorial writer must be one of the elders.

Detroit.

JOHN RICHARD STORRS.

[The opinions here expressed merit careful consideration. Is the modern politician, as a rule, faithless or faithful to the ethical standards of what Senator Walsh styles "the profession of politics"?—Ed. AMERICA.]

Catholic Reading Rooms

To the Editor of AMERICA:

An open door to the Catholic Faith, as far as human means are concerned, would be Catholic reading rooms. Here the outsider could browse through Catholic books at his leisure and consult the Catholic layman or woman in charge. Here would be two of the greatest helps the interested or merely curious non-Catholic could have—a wealth of books on every phase of Catholicism and a willing and well-informed Catholic person, not a priest, with whom objections and difficulties could be discussed.

How would such rooms be established? They should be rented in fairly prominent sections and streets of the city or town, and

well advertised as open to all. The rental would probably be the one large expense, since many of the books might be donated by interested Catholics. It should not be hard to find Catholic college graduates who would be willing to give at least part-time services for little or nothing. Such are some of the larger details.

But the interesting point is that non-Catholic denominations already conduct such reading rooms. The Christian Scientists, for instance, have a number of them in Boston. It is true that only a small and restricted set of books is available in these particular rooms, but the magnificent furnishings there might well be substituted for in the Catholic establishments by a fuller library of books. The Christian Science rooms are inviting in their appearance, suitable and attractive for reading, and the person in charge courteous in answering any questions you may wish to ask.

Catholic open libraries like this would also be a great convenience for Catholics themselves. Naturally a lending system would be impossible and undesirable in such places, but the opportunity to become acquainted with and to read the wealth of Catholic works that exist constitutes a strong argument for this plan. The ordinary public library gives no idea of what Catholic books are available, either as a whole or on any particular subject. For Catholics to be able to drop in at such a reading room would be the solution for many an idle hour and the cause of much incentive to Catholic spirituality, intellectuality, and action. Nor would its least advantage be an increased interest in and patronage of Catholic books.

This letter is not merely a suggestion in regard to such an enterprise. It is an open invitation to any groups or individuals who feel interested and able to establish such a Catholic reading room that they consult their Bishop and arrange to put the plan into effect.

Weston, Mass.

HASTINGS BLAKE, S.J.

[Some time ago a zealous young lady, a college graduate, thought this reading-room idea would be a fruitful way to which she might devote her spare time. Her father gave his approval, and knowing that a check book was the most important item for such a venture, placed his at her disposal. She went ahead and fitted up an attractive room on a leading street and secured considerable publicity for the enterprise. After a while the uptown location seemed to mistake and a change was made to the downtown business section. Both registered dismal failure.—Ed. AMERICA.]

Literalists and Poets

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your correspondent, Edward Wiley Gorman, quoting the "Summa" of St. Thomas, has made the mistake, not altogether rare, of taking the objections urged against a thesis as the opinions of the Angelic Doctor himself. The Article in question is directed against one of those Jews who held that everything in the Old Testament was to be understood literally and that no metaphors were to be found there. St. Thomas rejects the opinion because metaphors are necessary, useful, and attractive to man. In answering the particular objection he seems to consider no reply necessary to the derogatory statement about poetry, made, presumably, by the Jewish literalists and complacently cited by their modern representative.

St. Thomas, who was himself a poet, could not disdain an art which God used as a medium of Revelation in both the Old and the New Testament. In a true sense poetry is the natural language of the divine. All truths of God and of the spiritual are analogical and must come to us through the imagination. The language of the imagination and of analogy is the language of poetry. David in his Psalms and Our Blessed Lady in her Magnificat and Our Lord in His parables are all poets; and, as in the past, so in the future, their poems will be "friendly lights amid the encircling gloom" long after the arid generalizations of literal ethicists pass into the oblivion which these formulae escape for the moment. "Let me write the songs of a nation, and I care not who writes its laws," was said by no literal legalist.

New York City.

CHARLES A. FOX.